

The Classical Review

AUGUST 1911

ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTIONS

A WRESTLING MATCH IN NONNUS.

THERE is a point in connexion with Greek wrestling which, as it seems to me, has not been satisfactorily explained by Mr. Norman Gardiner either in his articles in the *Journal of Hellenic Studies* (xxv. 14, 263, xxvi. 4) or in his recent book, *Greek Athletic Sports and Festivals*. The question is this. When it was a case of a fight to a finish how did the vanquished wrestler acknowledge defeat? All that Mr. Gardiner says is, 'In the pankration, as in boxing, the contest continued till one or other of the parties held up his hand in sign of defeat' (p. 435). Elsewhere, when dealing with boxing, he writes, 'Usually the fight went on until one of the two acknowledged himself defeated (*ἀπειπεῖν*) by holding up his hand' (p. 415, and cf. pp. 424, 440). For this he relies upon the evidence of vase paintings, and adduces no authority from literature. In boxing there seems to be no need for any such special means of acknowledging defeat. If knocked down and unable to rise and continue the combat the pugilist would simply be counted out: if not, he could at any moment end the fight by merely saying that he was beaten. So again in wrestling proper no question could arise, as the judges would decide when the requisite number of falls had taken place. But in ground wrestling it is a different matter. Here some recognised sign of yielding was necessary, and the question is, What was that

sign? If it is suggested that here too all that was required was a verbal confession of defeat, I would point out that victory was usually obtained by getting a strangling grip of the throat which effectually prevented speech. The answer to this question will, I think, be found in the account of the match between Aeacus and Aristaeus as reported in the *Dionysiaca* of Nonnus (xxxvii. 554 sqq.). It will be convenient to consider this passage, as arranged in the edition of Koechly (1858), in three divisions:

πρώτος Ἀρισταῖος, μετέπειτα δὲ δεύ-
τερος ἔστη
555 Αἰακὸς εὐπαλάμοιο πάλης δεδαη-
μένος ἔργα.
ζώματι δὲ σκεπόμενους ἀθηήτου
φύσιν αἰδοῦς
γυμνοὶ ἀεθλεύσαντες ἐφέστασαν·
ἀμφοτέρω δὲ
πρῶτα μὲν ἀμφοτέρας παλάμας ἐπὶ
δίξυγι καρπῷ
σύμπλεκον ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα, χυτῆς ἐπὶ
νώτα κοινῆς
560 ἀλλήλους ἐρύοντες ἀμοιβαδὶς, ἄμματι
χειρῶν
ἀκροτάτῳ σφίγγαντες· ἦν δ' ἀμφι-
δρομος ἀνὴρ,
ἄνδρα παλινδίνητον ἄγων ἑτερόξυγι
παλμῷ,
ἔλκων ἐλκόμενός τε· συνοχμάζοντο
γὰρ ἄμφω
χερσὶν ἀμοιβαίησιν, ἐκρυτῶσαντο δὲ
δειρήν,

- 565 μεσσατίῳ δὲ κάρηνον ἐπηρείδοντο
 μετώπῳ
 ἀκλινέες, νένοντες ἐπὶ χθονός· ἐκ δὲ
 μετώπῳ
 θλιβομένων καμάτοιο προάγγελος
 ἔρρεεν ἰδρώς·
 ἀμφοτέρων δ' ἄρα νῶτα κεκυφότα
 πήχεος ὀλκῷ
 δίξυμι συμπλεκέος παλάμης ἐτρίβετο
 δεσμῷ·
 570 σμῶδιξ δ' αὐτοτέλεστος ἀνέδραμεν
 αἵματι θερμῷ,
 αἰόλα πορφύρουσα· δέμας δ' ἐστίζετο
 φωτῶν.
 οἱ δὲ παλαισμοσύνης ἐτερότροπα
 μάγγανα τέχνης
 ἀλλήλοισ ἀνέφαινον ἀμοιβαδὶς· ἀντί-
 βιον δὲ
 πρῶτος Ἀρισταῖος παλάμης πηχύν-
 νατο καρπῷ,
 575 ἐκ χθονός ὀχλίξων· δολίης δ' οὐ
 λήθετο τέχνης
 Αἰακὸς αἰολόμητις, ὑποκλέπτοντι δὲ
 ταρσῷ
 λαῖον Ἀρισταῖοιο ποδὸς κώληπα
 πατάξας
 ὕπτιον αὐτοκύλιστον ὅλον περικάβ-
 βαλε γαίῃ,
 ἡλιβάτῳ πρηῶνι πανείκελον· ἀμφὶ
 δὲ λαοὶ
 580 τηλίκον αὐχέντα βοώμενον υἷα
 Φοῖβον
 ὄμμασι θαμβαλέοισιν ἐθήγησαντο
 πεσόντα.

Up to this point we have an exhibition of ὀρθή πάλη. Mr. Gardiner says (J.H.S. xxv. 26), 'The first round follows closely the Homeric model. Aristaeus tries to lift and swing Aeacus, who clicks his left knee with his heel and so throws him backwards.' On this I would only say that in spite of the authority of Eustathius and Suidas, followed by modern scholars, *ex. gr.* Liddell and Scott and Dr. Leaf, I am inclined to think that κώληψ is not 'the hollow or bend of the knee,' but rather 'the ankle,' and that the action described is the kicking away the foot of the wrestler the moment he lifts his opponent from the ground. The passage in Homer (*Il.* xxiii. 726) does not help either view, but Nonnus, who uses the word thrice, always calls it κώληψ ποδός. If it means 'ankle' the addition is natural enough, but if it means 'the

hollow of the knee' we shall be compelled to translate ποδός 'of the leg,' which I think is hardly possible. Liddell and Scott say (*s.v.* πούς) 'also of the leg with the foot . . . *Il.* xxiii. 772, *Od.* xiii. 261, etc.,' but I can see no reason for so translating the word in either of these places, and a comparison of the other passages in Nonnus (*x.* 354, 368) will, I think, show that he at least took it to mean 'ankle.' So, too, Nicander (*Ther.* 424) refers to the bite of a snake:

ὅτ' ἐν κώληπος ἢ ἐν ποδὸς ἔχνεϊ τύψη.

I may add that in all these passages the old Latin translation gives *talus*, while the scholiast on Nicander, *l.c.*, says 'κώληπος· ἥγουν ἰσπραγάλου,' citing the passage in Homer. Let us now proceed to the second round:

- 582 δεύτερος ἤεртаζε μετάρσιον ὑψόθι
 γαίης
 κουφίζων ἀμογητὶ πελώριον υἷα
 Κυρήνης
 Αἰακὸς, ἐσσομένην ἀρετὴν τεκέεσσι
 φυλάσσω,
 585 ἀκαμάτῳ Πηλῇ καὶ εὐρυβίῃ Τελα-
 μῶνι,
 ἀγκὰς ἔχων, οὐ νῶτον ἢ ὄρθιον αὐχέντα
 κάμπτων,
 πήχεσιν ἀμφοτέροισι μεσαίτατον
 ἄνδρα κομίζων,
 ἴσον ἀμειβόντεσιν ἔχων τύπον, οὓς
 κάμε τέκτων
 πρηῶνων ἀνέμοιοι θυελλήεσσαν ἀνά-
 κην.
 590 καὶ πελάσας ὅλον ἄνδρα περιστρω-
 θέντα κοίῃ
 Αἰακὸς ἀντιπάλαιο μέσων ἐπεβήσατο
 νῶτων·
 καὶ πόδα πεπταμένης διὰ γαστέρος
 ἐκτάδα πέμπων,
 καμπύλον ἀκροτάτῳ περὶ γούνατι
 δεσμὰ συνάπτων,
 ταρσῷ ταρσὸν ἔρειδε παρὰ σφυρὸν
 ἄκρον ἐλίξας·
 595 καὶ ταχὺς ἀντιβίου τετανυσμένος
 ὑψόθι νῶτων·
 χεῖρας εἰς στεφανηδὸν ἐπ' ἀλλή-
 λῃσιν ἐλίξας,
 αὐχένι δεσμὸν ἔβαλλε βραχίονι,
 δάκτυλα κάμφας·
 μυδαλέῳ δ' ἰδρώτι χυτὴν ἔρραιε
 κοίῃν,
 αὐχμηρῇ ψαμάθῳ διερὴν ῥαθάμην
 καθαιρων,

600 μὴ διολισθήσειε περίπλοκος ἄμματι
χειρῶν
θερμῇν τριβομένοιο κατ' αὐχένος
ἱκμάδα πέμπτων.

It seems fairly obvious that lines 588, 9 are out of place. A single man, οὐ νῶτον ἢ ὄρθιον αὐχένα κάμπτων, cannot resemble a pair of rafters. They clearly belong to the description of the first bout, and a comparison with the passage in Homer suggests that they should be placed after line 537, with a change of ἔχων to ἔχον. Mr. Gardiner's comment is, 'But the second bout diverges widely from Homer. Aeacus tries to lift Aristaeus, but failing to do so he springs suddenly round him and jumps upon his back, twisting his legs round his stomach and knotting his hand round his neck so that he cannot speak.' It will be seen at once that by a curious oversight Mr. Gardiner has misrepresented what occurred. Aeacus does lift Aristaeus and throw him, subsequently assuming the position, and getting the grip, described above. Then Nonnus continues:

τοῦ δὲ πιεζομένοιο συνέρρεον ὀξεί
παλμῷ
κεκριμένοι κήρυκες, ὀπιευτῆρες
ἀγῶνος,
μή μιν ἀποκτείνειεν ὁμόζυγι πῆχους
ὀλκῷ.
605 οὐ γὰρ ἔην τότε θεσμὸς ὁμοίος, δν
πάρος αὐτοῖ
ὀψίγονοι φράσαντο, τιταινομένων
ὅτε δεσμῶν
αὐχενίων πνικτῆρι πόνῳ βεβαρη-
μένος ἀνὴρ
νίκην ἀντιπάλου μνηστεύεται
ἔμφρονι συγῇ,
ἀνέρι νικήσαντι κατηφέα χεῖρα πε-
τάσας.

'The officials,' says Mr. Gardiner, 'interfere to save him from death; "for," says Nonnus, "there was no law such as later generations long ago devised by which the vanquished could give a sign of his defeat by turning down his thumb."' In the first place the action of turning down the thumb is not that which Mr. Gardiner elsewhere represents, on the authority of vase paintings, as the sign of defeat,

viz., the holding up of the hand,¹ and in the second he has mistaken the meaning of κατηφής. Nonnus, who has the word frequently, always uses it in a moral, not in a physical, sense, as a single instance within the next four lines will show; the son of Aristaeus takes the loser's reward.

δεύτερα πατρός ἄεθλα κατηφέϊ χειρὶ
κομίζων.

There is, therefore, no idea of 'turning down the thumb,' and the line must be translated 'stretching a dejected hand to the conqueror.'² If anyone will take the trouble to assume the position of Aristaeus, and allow a friend, on whose powers of self-restraint he can rely, to act the part of Aeacus, he will find that it is an absolute impossibility to stretch out a hand, whether dejected or not, to his victor, and will wonder why 'later generations' should have devised anything so fatuous. The simple explanation is that they did not devise anything of the sort, and that Nonnus never said that they did. The whole credit of the invention belongs to an early commentator according to Koechly, who, after quoting the actual words of Nonnus, remarks, 'quod egregie em. G<raefius> quem recte secutus est Ma<rcellus>.' Even the boldest corrector of texts will admit that an emendation which involves the alteration of all the words, five in number, in a line requires some very strong support from the context to justify its existence, and that when the

¹ The similar statement in Smith's *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities*, vol. ii., p. 328, 'The victory was not decided until one of the parties was killed, or lifted up a finger, thereby declaring that he was unable to continue the contest either from pain or fatigue,' is not borne out by the language of Philostratus (*Imag.* ii. 6), who is cited as the authority for the statement. He only says καὶ τὸ ἀπαγορεῖον ἐπισημαίνων τῇ χειρὶ, words as applicable to the procedure related by Nonnus as to that stated in the Dictionary.

² The phrase χεῖρα πετάσας is in itself questionable. Homer has χεῖρε πετάσας, but never χεῖρα: neither has Nonnus elsewhere nor, as far as I know, any other writer. If he wished to express the stretching out of a hand, it is strange that he should not have used τανύσας (ii. 234) or, more probable still, his favourite τιταίων or τιτήνας (vii. 27; xxi. 124 *et al.*).

result is to change a perfectly clear and intelligible statement into what may fairly be described as 'clotted nonsense,' the epithet 'egregious,' though not quite in Koehly's sense of the word, may rightly be applied to it. Now what did Nonnus say according to the MS. evidence as reported by Koehly, and as printed in the edition of Lectius (1606)? Why this—

ἀνέρα νικήσαντα κατηφέει χειρὶ
πατάξας.¹

Precisely. Aristaeus is lying flat on his face upon the ground. Aeacus is lying on top of him, 'knotting his hand round his neck so that he cannot speak.'

¹ If authority is required to support this phrase, I would refer to the following passages in Nonnus, in addition to l. 577 *supra*.

σφαῖραν ἄτε θρώσκουσιν, ἀτέρμονι χειρὶ πατάξας (ii. 465).
ἄλλον ἀπηλίοισεν ἀφειδέϊ δουρὶ πατάξας (xxii. 203).
πεπταμένη δὲ μέτωπον ἀφειδέϊ χειρὶ πατάξας
ψευδαλιόν σέο θάμβος ἐχέφρονι δέικνυε σιγῇ (xlii 229).

Also, from the Paraphrase of St. John, i. 199 :

βαίματι πιστὰ μέτωπα θεοῦδεῖ χειρὶ πατάξας.

Thereupon Aristaeus does the only thing he can possibly do, namely taps his adversary to show that he gives in. Those who have seen the Japanese jiu-jitsu, characterised by Mr. Gardiner as 'the closest parallel to the pankration' (*J.H.S.* xxvi. 13), will recognise that this is exactly the way in which a wrestler, finding himself in a hopeless position, gives up the contest, namely by tapping either his adversary or the ground. The statement of Nonnus is confirmed by a passage in Lucian (*Anach.* § 1), referred to by Mr. Gardiner in *J.H.S.* xx. 264, and partially quoted on p. 441 of his book. Anacharsis watching such a bout as that described above, thus addresses Solon :

καὶ ἦν ἰδοὺ ἀράμενος ἐκεῖνοσὶ τὸν ἕτερον
ἐκ τοῖν σκελοῖν ἀφῆκεν εἰς τὸ ἔδαφος,
εἰτ' ἐπικαταπεσὼν ἀνακύπτειν οὐκ ἔα
συνωθῶν κάτω εἰς τὸν πηλόν, τέλος δὲ
ἤδη περιπλέξας αὐτῷ τὰ σκέλη κατὰ τὴν
γαστέρα, τὸν πῆχυν ὑποβαλὼν τῷ λαίμῳ,
ἀγχει τὸν ἄθλιον· ὁ δὲ παρακροτεῖ εἰς
τὸν ὦμον, ἰκετεύων οἶμαι, ὥς μὴ
τέλεον ἀποπνιγείη.

HERBERT W. GREENE.

NIC. ETH. IV. III. 15. 1123^b31.

In view of some questions which have been put to me, I may be allowed to return to the subject of my article in the *Classical Review* of August 10, 1910.

1. The words in that article: 'The point is not that the *μεγαλόψυχος* would not retreat, but that if he had to do it, he would retreat as became a man of dignified courage,' were not intended to imply that *φεύγειν* here means to 'retreat in general.' I supposed that *φεύγειν* itself was denied of the *μεγαλόψυχος*. He would retreat in a dignified manner, and not fly off at a sprinting pace. This would have been clear if to the words quoted above had been added, 'a retreat, not an undignified headlong flight.'

2. In racing, as in walking, some movement of the arms is natural and is a help, though athletes may differ as to the manner of it. Certainly the *μεγαλόψυχος* would look ridiculous if he held his arms stiff in running.

But whether what was exactly meant by *παρασεῖν τὰς χεῖρας* was an ungraceful movement or not, I venture to think Aristotle had not that in his mind, and that it is not the point of the passage. So far I disagree with what I spoke of as the ordinary view. The undignified thing I suppose intended is simply the racing away from the enemy; *παρασεῖσαντι* being put in not to express any ungraceful bodily movement, but a characteristic of the racer's action—'going at all speed'—'sprinting off to the rear.'

3. The use of *παρασεῖν* without expressed accusative for *παρασεῖν τὰς χεῖρας* should hardly cause difficulty. That runners were said *παρασεῖν τὰς χεῖρας* appears from *De. Inc. An.* 705^a 16, διὸ καὶ οἱ πένταθλοι ἄλλονται πλείον ἔχοντες τοὺς ἀλτήρας ἢ μὴ ἔχοντες, καὶ οἱ θεόντες θάττον θεοῦσι παρασεῖοντες τὰς χεῖρας· γίνεται γὰρ τις ἀπέρισις ἐν τῇ

διατά
πούς
a com
in a
about
often
could
under
ing p
ὁμοίω
τοὺς ὁ
παρα
μεῖζον
ὁ δὲ
σείων
no tr
παρα
χεῖρας
that i
did n
expre
χεῖρας
for pa
tolera
ὁ πέ
ἀπερ
logica
objec
guage
ἔχων
In ὁ
σείων
objec
is ea
while
time
Bu
seems
itself
μὴ ἔλ
σείων
the p
been
claus
the o
if πα
absol
The
claus
stitut
the p
possi
absol
confi
wise
quote
4.

διατάσει πρὸς τὰς χεῖρας καὶ τοὺς καρπούς: and it is only in accordance with a common phenomenon of language that in a phrase like this, in constant use about racing, the accusative should be often, indeed usually, dropped, as there could be no doubt what was to be understood. Compare also the following passage from the *Problems* 881^b3—ὁμοίως δὲ τούτῳ καὶ ὁ πένταθλος πρὸς τοὺς ἀλτήρας (sc. ἀπερίδεται) καὶ ὁ θέων παρασείων πρὸς τὰς χεῖρας. διὸ ὁ μὲν μείζον ἄλλεται ἔχων ἢ μὴ ἔχων ἀλτήρας, ὁ δὲ θάττον θεῖ παρασείων ἢ μὴ παρασείων. If it be objected that this is no true instance because the object of παρασείων is inferred from πρὸς τὰς χεῖρας (sc. ἀπερίδεται), it may be replied that if παρασείων attributed to a runner did not of itself imply χεῖρας, such an expression as ὁ θέων παρασείων πρὸς τὰς χεῖρας ἀπερίδεται with χεῖρας inferred for παρασείων would be too harsh to be tolerable. Otherwise we might justify ὁ πένταθλος ἔχων πρὸς τοὺς ἀλτήρας ἀπερίδεται, for here the inference could logically just as well be made that the object of ἔχων was ἀλτήρας. But language does not allow of this, because ἔχων does not suggest its own object. In ὁ θέων παρασείων, the word παρασείων would naturally suggest its own object; and so in the context before it is each time without expressed object, while ἀλτήρας is of course added each time to ἔχων.

But in any case the second clause seems to give sufficient evidence of itself—διὸ ὁ μὲν μείζον ἄλλεται ἔχων ἢ μὴ ἔχων ἀλτήρας, ὁ δὲ θάττον θεῖ παρασείων ἢ μὴ παρασείων. For even if in the preceding clause χεῖρας had actually been supplied, the omission of it in this clause, where ἀλτήρας intervenes and is the only accusative, would be intolerable if παρασείων could not itself be used absolutely as implying its own object. The contention in the case of both clauses is illustrated by the effect of substituting κινῶν for παρασείων throughout the passage. The result would be impossible, because κινῶν cannot be used absolutely for κινῶν τὰς χεῖρας. This confirms what I must think the otherwise certain interpretation of the passage quoted from Theophrastus (see below).

4. My explanation of φεύγειν παρα-

σεῖσαντι may perhaps seem to involve a difficulty about the connexion with it of the next sentence οὐδ' ἀδικεῖν, τίνος γὰρ ἔνεκα πράξει αἰσχροῦ ᾧ γ' οὐδὲν μέγα; To say 'it would not at all befit the μεγαλόψυχος to sprint off in a retreat, nor to be unjust either, etc.,' may seem to make a harsh and illogical co-ordination of a single undesirable act of a limited kind with the whole field of injustice (ἀδικεῖν) and vice in general (cf. μὴ ἀγαθός).

But the difficulty is only apparent, and is removed by a consideration of the context.

A thought which Aristotle has before him in the passage, and to which he gives expression several times, is this:—

The μεγαλόψυχος is one who claims the highest distinction in all departments of conduct, and really deserves it—μεγάλων αὐτὸν ἀξίων ἄξιος ὢν (1123^b2). As (a) having such distinction, he must a fortiori (β) have the ordinary virtues. Thus (1123^b27-29) since he is μεγίστων ἄξιος he (a) has the highest excellence (ἀριστος ἀν εἶη), and therefore (β) must have ordinary excellence (δεῖ ἀγαθὸν εἶναι). Again (a) to the μεγαλόψυχος belongs τὸ ἐν ἐκάστῃ ἀρετῇ μέγα (1123^b30), and μεγαλοψυχία is κόσμος τις τῶν ἀρετῶν, μείζους γὰρ αὐτὰς ποιεῖ (1124^a1), and therefore a fortiori (β) the possession of the ἀρεταί is the sine qua non of μεγαλοψυχία and οὐ γίνεταί ἀνευ ἐκείνων.

In the passage before us Aristotle is putting these two things (a and β) negatively, by denying (a) undignified action, and (β) unjust and unvirtuous action in general of the μεγαλόψυχος; and on the same ground as before, viz., the high pretensions and deserts of the μεγαλόψυχος. These claims are implied in οὐδαμῶς ἀν ἀρμόζοι, and γελοῖος, which corresponds to it below.

It will be well to quote the passage more fully:

οὐδαμῶς τ' ἀν ἀρμόζοι μεγαλοψύχῳ φεύγειν παρασεῖσαντι, οὐδ' ἀδικεῖν, τίνος γὰρ ἔνεκα πράξει αἰσχροῦ ᾧ γ' οὐδὲν μέγα; καθ' ἕκαστα δ' ἐπισκοποῦντι πάνπαν γελοῖος φαίνοιτ' ἀν ὁ μεγαλόψυχος μὴ ἀγαθὸς ὢν.

The argument then would be as follows:

On the one hand (a) undignified

action such as *φεύγειν παρασείσαντι* is incompatible with the claims of a *μεγαλόψυχος*, as he aims at the *μέγα ἐν ἐκάστη ἀρετῇ*; and so also, on the other hand, (β) is an unvirtuous action (cf. *μὴ ἀγαθός*) such as injustice incompatible with his claims, for the disgraceful gain of injustice would be nothing to a man of such a high standard; and in general, absence of ordinary virtue (*μὴ ἀγαθὸς ὢν*) would be ridiculous for a man of his pretensions.

The sense of the passage may be paraphrased thus: (α) undignified action, such as flying off at a racing pace in a retreat, would not be at all consistent with the pretensions of a *μεγαλόψυχος*, nor (β) would such unvirtuous action as injustice either, for the disgraceful gain of it would be no temptation to one who thinks nothing of great importance. And generally any unvirtuous action would be ridiculous for a man with his standard.

5. As to the difficulty raised about the combination of the aorist with a present, it was not enough, I ventured to think, to object *simpliciter* to an interpretation that it treats the aorist like a present, considering the idiomatic uses, discussed in the grammars, of the aorist where our idiom requires the present, and particularly the use of the aorist participle for an action contemporaneous with that of the principal verb.

Questions of idiom can only be settled empirically, and it is sometimes at least advisable not to allow an interpretation to be decided by a doubtful theory of a grammatical formula. On the other hand, if it happens that we can fairly determine what the passage must mean, as I imagine we can in the present case, that helps to determine the idiom. For such a usage as that involved by the interpretation here proposed, it is not necessary to give a theory if one can find satisfactory parallels.

I venture to think we have the kind of parallel wanted in a familiar Homeric expression:

βῆ δὲ κατ' Οὐλύμποιο καρήνων αἶξασα.

Here an attribute of the motion, always contemporaneous with it, is put in the aorist participle. A contemporaneous state with a verb in a historic tense is

put normally with the present, the tense of the aorist being determined relatively to the time of the principal verb—e.g., *Od. ρ 524 ἵκετο πῆματα πάσχων*; *π 424 ἦ οὐκ οἶσθ' ὅτε δέωρο πατήρ τεός ἵκετο φεύγων*. But with the same principal verb and same tense of it we have the aorist participle in a passage which seems to give another good parallel to the one before us, *Od. κ 117*:

τὼ δὲ δὺ αἶξαντε φωνῇ ἐπὶ νῆας ἵκεσθον.

To what grammatical category the usage should be referred may be a matter of dispute. *δακρύσασα δ' ἔπειτα προσήυδα θεῖον αἰοιδόν* (*Od. α 336*) suggested itself as a parallel. If the passage belongs to this class, a still better parallel is *Soph. Aj. 207-8, Αἴας θολερῶ κείται χειμῶνι νοσήσας* quoted by Kühner, § 386. 5. 2nd edn. (who, I observe, has also quoted the above passage *Od. α 336*), as an instance of the aorist used for the 'Eintreten einer Handlung.' Another instance with present of principal verb is *Soph. Phil. 58-9*.

The aorist participle, then, would be used of an action or state which, while contemporaneous with the action or state of the principal verb and connected with it, originated, with the latter action or state itself, at a time previous to that indicated by the actual tense of the principal verb.

For the justification of the idiom as apart from a theory of its explanation, one would rely rather on the Homeric passages, because they give instances of rapid motion and an attribute of it, like the Aristotelian text.¹

¹ Since this article was in proof, a friend, who has looked into the matter for me, has found that the *Ethics* passage has already been associated with the Homeric *βῆ δὲ αἶξασα* by Monro, *Homeric Grammar*, § 77, who says that the participle of the aorist is sometimes used to express exact coincidence with the action of the principal verb, and that this is especially found with verbs expressing the manner with which a thing is said or done. He gives *Arist. Eth. IV. iii. 15* as an instance of the special usage. This view is akin to Madvig, *Gk. Synt.*, § 183, An. 2, where the participle is translated by 'indem' and 'dadurch dass.' Madvig, however, speaks only of the case of a momentary contemporaneous act, whereas the case before us is the momentary beginning of a continuous action.

It will be observed that the parallel passage from Theophrastus already quoted (*Classical Review*, xxiv. 5, p. 144) shows the same kind of combination of aorist participles with a present—

παρασείσαντα δὴ δέϊ τοὺς τοιοῦτους τῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ διαράμενον ἀπαλ-
λάττεσθαι ὅστις ἀπύρετος βούλεται εἶναι.

As indicated in my previous article, this passage is suspected. But it shows at least how the writer understood the Aristotelian passage, and that he thought the aorist natural, for he put his own addition in the aorist.

J. COOK WILSON.

New College, Oxford.

NOTES ON PROPERTIUS.

I. xv. 33.

multa prius! vasto labentur flumina ponto,
annus et inversas duxerit ante vices,
quam tua sub nostro mutetur pectore cura:
sis quodcumque voles, non aliena tamen.
† quamtibi † ne viles isti videantur ocelli
per quos saepe mihi credita perfidia est.

Palmer's *tam mihi* does not seem adequate: if this was what Propertius meant, why should he say *tam mihi ne viles* instead of *ne mihi tam viles*?

The following parallels strongly favour *quare*:

quare quid possit mea Cynthia, desine, Galle,
quaerere.

I. v. 31.

quare, si pudor est, quam primum errata faterere.

I. ix. 33.

quare, dum licet, inter nos laetemur amantes.

I. xix. 25.

quare, si sapis, oblatas ne desere messes.

II. xvi. 7.

quare, ne tibi sit tanti Sidonia vestis.

II. xvi. 55.

quare ne tibi sit mirum me quaerere viles.

II. xxiv. 9.

The stages of corruption may be supposed to have been *quare*: *quate*: *quam te*: *quamtibi*. Actually the *i* of *tibi* in N is not a well-traced *i*.

I. xxi.

The form of epitaph, in which the buried man is represented as addressing the passer-by and charging him with a message to his kinsfolk in another place, is common enough in Greek: e.g. *Anth. Pal.* vii. 499, 500, 502. Usually the message is to tell that he is dead and where he is buried. But there is at least one example (by Agathias) of the dead man forbidding the passer-by to take home any word of his death:

μηδὲν ἀπαγγείλαις ἐς Ἀντιόχειαν, ὀδῖτα,
μὴ πάλιν οἰμῶξ χεῦματα Κασταλῆς
κ.τ.λ.

Anth. Pal. vii. 589.

If vv. 5, 6 of this poem of Propertius are correctly read (as I believe)

sic te servato possint gaudere parentes
ne soror acta tuis sentiat e lacrimis,

it belongs to the second and the less usual type. Vv. 7, 8 explain what are the *acta* which are not to be communicated to the dead man's sister. But a correction is needed in v. 10. Read:

et quaecumque super dispersa invenerit ossa
montibus Etruscis, nesciat esse mea
quaecumque NAF quicumque DV.

Just as he wishes his sister not to hear of his fate, so (if the piece is to be coherent) he must wish her *not* to know that any bones she may find scattered on the hills are his. Mr. Butler reads *nec sciat*, which seems to me slightly less probable: *nec* would be for *ne quidem*.

II. x. 23.

ut caput in magnis ubi non est tangere signis,
ponitur hac imos ante corona pedes,
sic nos nunc inopes laudis conscendere carmen
pauperibus sacris vilia tura damus.

23. carmen O culmen ε.

To support the astonishing metaphor, *laudis conscendere carmen*, one could adduce

candida concessos ascendat Ciris honores
Ciris 205

and such a phrase as

hi qui nuper de numero gentium congregati nec
praevalentes evangelicam perfectionem *con-*
scendere.

Cassian, *de inst. coenob.* VII. xvii. 5.

In the verse

denique stelligeri *conscendas culmina caeli*
Sedulius Scottus, III. ii. 9
(*P.L.M.E.* iii. p. 233),

we have not a testimonium to the reading *culmen* in Propertius, but to Prudentius *contra Symmachum* 458.

Modern commentators dismiss the couplet with a perfunctory phrase about bold metaphor, but allege nothing which might serve to attest the authenticity of this most questionable piece of Latinity. But the strangeness of the metaphor might pass for Propertian, and the construction of *inopes* with an infinitive clause attached might pass for Horatian, were it not for a more definite objection. Two passages of Valerius Maximus, an author whose prose is thoroughly coloured with the language of Augustan poets, show us *inopes laudis* standing for a compound adjective. Now just as it is inconceivable that any Latin author should juxtapose the words *serus* and *studiorum*, and not mean them to bear the sense of *ὄψιμαθής*, but leave the genitive *studiorum* to be governed by something else in the sentence; so, if *inopes laudis* forms an organic unit, we must make what we can of the *conscendere carmen* by itself. These are the passages in Valerius:

Probestur nunc cuiuslibet gloriae cupidi, qui ex desertis montibus myoparonumque piraticis rostris *laudis inopes* laureae ramulos festinabunda manu decerpserunt (II. viii. 5).

Et maior natu minori, et fortissimus imbelli, et gloria excellens *laudis inopi*, et quod super omnia est, nondum Asiatico iam Africanus (legatum se ire promisit) (V. v. 1).

These appear to fix *laudis inopes* as = *ἄδοξοι*. What, then, are we to do with *conscendere carmen*? I suggest that *cāmen* should be *camena*, and that *conscendere* was expanded metri gratia out of *conscende*, which was itself a corruption of *poscente*.

Sic nos nunc, inopes laudis, poscente Camena,
(So do I now, I the inglorious, since I must obey the Muses' command. . .)

For *poscere* in such contexts, cf.

poscimur. Hor. *Od.* I. xxxii. 1.

non est mora libera nobis:
poscimur.

Ov. *Met.* II. 143.

Palilia poscor:
non poscor frustra si favet alma Ceres.
Fast. iv. 721.

In Propertius, IV. i. 74, *poscis ab invita verba pigenda lyra*, it is the poet who claims or commands a song; here, if I am right, it is the muse who summons the poet, just as Aeneas is he

quem numina poscunt (*Aen.* viii. 512).
Cf. ego poscor Olympo (*Ib.* 533).

II. xxxiv. 31, 2.

tu satius memorem Musis imitere Philetan
memorem Musis N Musis memorem FLDV
meliorem musis s.

Bergk and Schneidewin conjectured *tu Latiis Meropem*, and the word *Meropem* is commended by Meleager's *θεῖον Μερόπων ἄστρον* (*A.P.* vii. 418, cf. 419). But it is possible that a couple of Horatian idioms supply what is wanted:

meis contentus honestos
fascibus et sellis nollem *mihi sumere*.
Sat. I. vi. 97.

sume tibi deciens. *Sat.* II. iii. 237.

quis *sibi* res gestas Augusti scribere *sumit*?
Ep. I. iii. 7.

ingenium *sibi* quod vacuas *desumpsit* Athenas.
Ep. II. ii. 81.

and

ad Maecenatem *memori* si *mente* recurras.
Sat. II. vi. 31.

Read:

tu satius *memori* sumas tibi *mente* Philetan.
or *sumes*

III. ix. 43, 4.

inter Callimachi sat erit placuisse libellos
et cecinisse modis dure poeta tuis.

That Philetas is the poet indicated in the pentameter is certain; by what phrase Propertius here expressed his oft-praised model remains doubtful. Only palaeographical probability discredits Beroaldus' bold *Coe poeta*; Scriverius' *Dore poeta* has entered the text of many editions as a makeshift, but I have long lost any little faith that I ever had in it.

The following conjecture has, I think, a good deal of probability on two grounds, but is weak from lack of attestation to the particular form which it introduces.

One of the chief legendary heroes of Cos is Eurypylos (Homer, *Il.* II. 677), whom Propertius names in IV. v. 23:

Eurypylique placet Coae textura Minervae.
(Heinsius conjectured *Eurypyliisque*.)

Now if a patronymic be formed from this racial hero as Horace formed one from Virgil's *Iarbas*

rupit *Iarbitam* Timagenis aemula lingua.

(see Jahn's note cited in Orelli-Baiter-Mewes on Hor. *Ep.* I. xix. 15) as a poetical equivalent for *Cous* we might have *Eurypylites* or *Eurypylita*.

Once granted the possibility of the form, I think it will be allowed that

et cecinisse modis, *Eurypylita*, tuis

satisfies the other conditions of probability: the corruption of *Euripileta* or *Euripilita* into *dure poeta* is easy to suppose in such a context.

III. vi. 9.

si cū
sicut eam } incomptis vidisti flere capillis
siccine eam *vulg.*

The roughness of the elision makes the usual reading suspicious, and palaeographically it does not commend itself as accounting for the MS. tradition.

We ought to restore here an Ovidian idiom:

sic erit: haeserunt tenues in corde sagittae.

Am. I. ii. 7.

sic erit: ingenio prostitit illa meo.

Ib. III. xii. 8.

MS. authority favours *sic erat* in both these places, and Burmann defended it against Heinsius. Whichever tense stands, the meaning differs little from a *hoc illud*, except for the interrogative turn.

sic erat? incomptis, etc.

('Was this so? Did you really see?' etc.)

And so, pretty surely, we must read one or other in I. viii. 27:

sic erat. hic iurata manet! rumpantur iniqui!

III. vii. 49.

non tulit haec Paetus, stridorem audire procellae
et duro teneras laedere fune manus,

sed chio { thalamo } aut { orythia } terebintho
 { calamo } { orythia }
 { chalamo } { oronthea }
 { oryrrhia }

et fultum pluma versicolore caput.

Such is the sum of variants for this line, which, in spite of Rothstein's explanations, still leaves me uneasy about its Latinity. Can one really supply a positive verb for the second couplet out

of the *non tulit* of the first? *Amabat* is to be understood, says Rothstein; I remark that the MSS. offer us something very like *amavit* in the *amoaut*, or something very like *adamavit* (he 'hankered after'—a still more suitable sense) in the *alamoaut*.

What other circumstances of luxury did Paetus hanker after besides the feather-stuffed cushions? Inlaid wood in his bedroom, say the commentators. But is not this unexampled? Is there any evidence for inlays and veneers of thya, citrus, etc., employed in a bedroom?

Briefly, I suggest that for *sedchio-thalamoaut* we should read *sed cyathos adamavit*.

What of the remaining words? *Terebintho* is in no way suspect: both the timber and the perfumed oil were a familiar part of the paraphernalia of luxury. Pliny gives a vast deal of information about the tree and its uses. Amongst which he mentions that a certain Thericles was celebrated for making *calices* out of terebinth wood (xvi. 205), and that wine *e terebintho* (xiv. 112) was one of the innumerable aromatic decoctions, which (like modern liqueurs), originally invented for a medicinal purpose, became mere refinements of gulosity. The terebinth, then, may denote either the material of the *cyathi*, or the flavouring of their contents.

Remains the adjective. The terebinth grows in Macedonia; and, says Rothstein, the epithet, *Oricia*, means that it is shipped from Oricum. Virgil (*Aen.* x. 136) in a simile derived from *intarsia* work has the lines:

vel quale per artem
inclusum buxo aut Oricia terebintho
lucet ebur.

One passage has affected the other—that is certain. Not only the phrase *Oricia terebintho* in the clausula, but the medial hiatus as well make it certain. But has Virgil plagiarised? or Propertius? There is a third hypothesis, which is, that the familiar Virgilian verse has debauched the tradition of the Propertian. One *deterior* actually gives *Oronthea*. Why not *Oronthea*? If Macedonian terebinth shipped from Epirus can be called *Oricia*, why should not

Syrian terebinth shipped from Antioch be called *Oronthea*?

Paetus was soft, and could not stand hardships and perils of the sea, but he was also luxurious, and hankered after delicacies and refinements. It was to get money for these that he took to the sea. The early editors aptly entitle the piece, *de Morte Paeti ob avaritiam*.

sed cyathos adamavit Oronthea terebintho
et fultum pluma versicolore caput.

IV. v. 21.

si te eoa $\begin{pmatrix} \text{dororantum} \\ \text{doro-zantum} \\ \text{derorantum} \end{pmatrix}$ iuvat aurea ripa
et quae sub Tyria concha superbit aqua.

If anything is to be got from inference towards the mending of these rags, it is (1) that a river's name is concealed in the nonsense-word, which should agree with *ripa*; (2) that probably some gem was named in the hexameter, to which the Tyrian shell of the pentameter corresponds; (3) that some Eastern name would be likely.

Suppose a misplacing of three letters in the verse, viz. the *tee*, and the rudiments of an emendation at once begin to appear: For *sitēoadorozatum*, read *si oad orotee*—i.e., *si quid Orontheae . . . ripae*. Here is at least a framework. The adjective is supported by I. ii. 3:

aut quid Oronthea crines perfundere murra;

and perhaps by the reading just proposed in III. vii. 48; it pairs neatly enough with Tyria.

What is to be filled in? Now there is nothing *prima facie* suspicious about the words *iuvat aurea*.

si quid Orontheae . . . iuvat aurea ripae.

(*ripa* for *ripe* I take to be a mistaken assimilation to *aurea*.)

If a gem is named, I suggest that it was the *xanthus*.

The *xanthus* (Pliny, *N.H.* xxxvii. 168-9) is a variety of the bloodstone: est et alia eiusdem generis quae vocatur menui ab Indis, xanthos appellata a Graecis, e fulvo candicans. It comes from Arabia, so that Antioch (*Oronthea ripa*) would be as natural a place of export for it as for the perfumes of Arabia (*Oronthea murra*, I. ii. 3). Theo-

phrast. *Lapid.* § 37 (quoted by Sillig on Pliny, *loc. cit.*): ἄλλη δὲ (αἰματῖτις) ἢ καλουμένη ξανθή. οὐ ξανθὴ μὲν τὴν χροάν ἐκλευκος δὲ μᾶλλον δὲ καλοῦσι χρώμα οἱ Δωριεῖς ξανθόν.

It is not certain that this auburn-whitish gem could be called *aurea*; nor certain whether, if it be the right word here, Propertius Latinised it as *xanthus* feminine, or *xanthe*. In neither case is it a very long step, palaeographically, from *xantū*. The Mentelianus reads *derorantem*, the Groninganus *doro-xanthum*, according to Hertzberg. But if Propertius can describe the chrysolith as *flavo lumine*, it seems not unreasonable to think that he might call a *xanthus aurea*.

IV. xi. 29.

Sisyphē, mole vaces; taceant Ixionis orbes;
fallax tantaleo corripere liquor.

No emendations hitherto attempted of this passage deserve mention except *tantaleus*, which Heinsius brought in from the codex Groninganus, and Auratus' *corripere ore*, detestable rhythmically and condemned by the mood of *vaces* and *taceant*. It will hardly be disputed that a word for 'throat' or 'lips' seems to be demanded by the context, and that the most obvious word would be some case of the stem *fauc-*. Can the palaeographical probability be brought to meet the contextual probability?

Mr. Housman's restoration of *saucius* for *gallicus* in II. xiii. 48 furnishes another instance of the misreading of *u* into *ll*. Now this is a typical Irish corruption, that is to say, a typically likely corruption to arise in the copying of the text out of an Irish codex. The Irish *ll*, written in one movement of the pen, is hardly distinguishable from a slightly overelongated *u*. Add to this another common confusion of the same script, viz. *ce* or *ci* for *a*, and you have *fauce* converted into *falla*. I take it, then, that *fallax tantaleo* should read *fauce a tantalea* or *faucci tantaleae*: with a preference for the former, since the dative seems to be unexampled in this noun.

J. S. PHILLIMORE.

5, The College, Glasgow.

THE PRONUNCIATION OF UNMETRICAL GREEK VERSE.

It is characteristic of non-literary Greek verse, especially in metrical epigraphs, that it constantly violates metrical rules. Long syllables occur in place of short, short in place of long, and syllables are omitted or added at the whim of the composer. This is especially true of the Greek inscriptions of the eastern provinces of the Roman Empire. In some cases those inscriptions must be

scanned half by accent and half by quantity;¹ in most cases they baffle scansion on any principle.

An inscription found by Sir W. M. Ramsay and me at Kerpishli, on the border of Lycaonia and Galatia, in 1910, throws unique light on the local pronunciation of unmetrical verse. It runs as follows:

ΕΕ Sic ΑΥΡΜΑΝΗΑΝΤΩΝΕΙΝΟ
ΥΙΔΙΑΣΥΝΒΙΩΑΠΦΗΚΘΥΓΑ
ΤΡΙΛΑΛΑΚΕΓΓΟΝΟΙΣ ΜΑ
ΡΚΩΚΔΟΥΔΑΜΗΧΑΡΙΝ
ΑΝΕΣΤΗΕΕΝΤΙΣΔΕ
ΦΡΟΝΕΙΖΕΙΝΖΑΝΡΗΝΗ
ΟΣΥΝΗΕΝΕΚΕΝ

(1) Αὐρ(ήλιος) Μάνης Ἀντωνείνου
ἰδία συνβίω Ἀπφη καὶ
θυγατρὶ Λάλα καὶ ἐγγόνοις Μάρ-
κω καὶ Δούδᾳ μνήμης χάριν

ἀνέστησεν· τίς δὲ
φρονεῖ ξεινὸς ἀνὴρ μνη-
οσύνης ἔνεκεν

The letters ΞΕΙΝΖΑΝΡ are clearly cut and certain.

The concluding formula in this inscription is paralleled by others from the same district. In 1908 I copied the following inscription at Tchimen, near Kandil, a few hours south of Kerpishli:

ΑΙΜΙΔΑΣ
ΕΤΗΣΑΤΗ
ΙΔΙΑΜΗΤΡΙ
ΔΕΙΑΜΝΗ
ΜΗΧΑΡΙΝ
ΤΟΥΤΟ
ΑΙΕΣΤΙ
ΒΙΟΥΛΙΘΟΣ
ΑΛΛΟΓΑΡ
ΟΥΔΕΝ
ΣΙΤΙΣΤΩΔΕ
ΞΑΚΗΝΕΠ
ΣΗΜΑΤΙΧΣ

(2) . . . [ὅκ]
αἱ Μίδας [ἀν
έστησα τῇ
ιδία μητρὶ
5 Δείᾳ μνή-
μης χάριν
τοῦτο
γὰρ ἐστὶ
βίου λίθος
10 ἄλλο γὰρ
οὐδέν·
εἴ τις τῶδ[ε
κ]ακὴν ἐπ[ὶ
σήματι χ[ε
15 [ῖ]ρα προσοίσει]
κ.τ.λ.

The stone carrying this inscription was broken at top and bottom. The words εἴ τις, etc., must have been followed by the usual curse, ὀρφανὰ τέκνα λίποιτο χηρὸν βίον οἶκον ἔρημον. With

the help of this inscription I was able in 1910 to make more complete copies of two difficult inscriptions of Kozanlı (east of Kerpishli), published by Mr. Anderson in *J.H.S.* 1899, pp. 120, 121 (Nos. 119 and 123). The former of these should read:

ΜΕΝΑΝΞΡΟΣΚΑΙ
ΠΑΠΑΚΞΤΙΗΣΕΑ
ΠΙΑΜΗΤΡΙΓΛΥΧΥ
ΙΝΙΗΜΗΜΗΧΑΡΙΝ
ΥΤΣΞΙΒΙΟΥΚΡΕΙΤΟ
ΡΙΛΙΘΟΣΑΛΛΟΓΑΡΟΥ

ΧΑΡΝ

(3) Μέναν[δ]ρος καὶ
παπᾶς β[ε]πίησε Ἀ-
π[ι]πία μητρὶ γλυχυ-
τάτη μνήμης χάριν
5 μνημοσυνον το-
ῦτ[ε]ρ[ε] στὶ βίου κρείτο-
ρ[ε] λίθος, ἄλλο γὰρ οὐ-
δέ[ε]ν

¹ See Fraser in Ramsay's *Studies in the Eastern Rom. Provinces.*

I could find no trace of a letter after N in line 8. The name Βατρηος in Mr. Anderson's transcription must be given up: the sixth letter from the end can only be π, and the second last letter is ε: the horizontal bar is clearly engraved. Επίησε, like the commoner ἐπύησε, is an orthographic variety of ἐποίησε. I have placed the first letter of line 7 in square brackets, but it is practically certain. The stone is much worn, and the circular part of the letter was cut very shallow: but in certain lights it appears clearly.

A variation of the same formula occurs in Mr. Anderson's No. 123 (*loc. cit.*). I copied this text, adding a line. My copy exactly agrees with Mr. Anderson's in the first six lines: the next six lines should read:

ΜΝΗΜΟΣΥΝΟΝ ΤΟΥ
ΤΕΣΤΙΒΙΟΥΛΙΤΟΣΑΛ
ΛΟΓΑΡΟΥΔΕΝΤΙΣΔΕ
ΠΡΟΝΕΙΞΕΙΝΟCΑΝΗ
ΜΝΗΜΟΣΥΝΗΣΕΝΕ
//////////

- (4) μνημόσυνον τοῦ-
τ' ἐστὶ βίου λίτος ἄλ-
λο γὰρ οὐδέν· τίς [δ]ε
προνεῖ ξείνος ἀν[ρ]
μνημοσύνης ἐνε-
[κεν.]

Λίτος is put for λίθος: προνεῖ for φρονεῖ. The three latter inscriptions ring changes on what must have been a well-known formula in this district; it is also attested elsewhere.

- (2) τοῦτο γὰρ ἐστὶ βίου λίθος, ἄλλο γὰρ οὐδέν.

- (3) μνημόσυνον τοῦτ' ἐστὶ βίου κρείτορι λίθος, ἄλλο γὰρ οὐδέν.

- (4) μνημόσυνον τοῦτ' ἐστὶ βίου λίτος, ἄλλο γὰρ οὐδέν.

These expressions seem to be an unintelligent confusion of the idea, 'this monument is a stone and nothing more,' with that expressed in the common formula ὁ βίος ταῦτα. I cannot explain κρείτορι in No. 3.

The formula τίς δὲ (φ)ρονεῖ (or τίς δ' ἐφρόνει?) ξείνος ἀν[ρ], etc., in No. 4 appears alone as the concluding formula in No. 1. The text of No. 1, which was copied by Sir W. M. Ramsay and myself in company, is certain throughout. The orthography of ξεινζ has unusual interest in its bearing on the local pronunciation of Greek verse. The concluding words of No. 1 are identical with those of No. 4. The pentameter in the latter inscription does not scan, and similar imperfect metres are common in Asia Minor. But I have observed no other instance in which the orthography accommodates itself to the metre. In No. 4 ξείνος fills the space assigned to one short syllable, and the reading ξεινζ proves beyond doubt that in pronunciation the word was slurred and contracted to a single short syllable. The use of the Ionic form does not necessarily imply that the first syllable in ξείν(ος) was long: εἰ is constantly used as an equivalent for short ι in Anatolian inscriptions. The final syllable -ος did not entirely disappear in pronunciation, but was softened to ζ. The line accordingly scans:

τίς δὲ φρο|νεῖ ξεινζ α̃|νῆρ | μνημοσύ|νης
ἐνε|κεν.

W. M. CALDER.

Brasenose College, Oxford.

NOTES

DEM. CHERS., p. 107, §§ 69, 70.

THE text (Oxford, Bekker, Sandys, etc.) reads as follows:

ὅστις δ' ὑπὲρ τοῦ βελτίστου πολλὰ τοῖς ὑμετέροις ἐναντιοῦται βουλήμασιν,

καὶ μηδὲν λέγει πρὸς χάριν, ἀλλὰ τὸ βέλτιστον αἰεὶ, καὶ τὴν τοιαύτην πολιτείαν προαιρεῖται ἐν ἧ πλειόνων ἡ τύχη κυρία γίνεταί ἢ οἱ λογισμοί, τούτων δ' ἀμφοτέρων ἑαυτὸν ὑπεύθυνον ὑμῖν παρέχει, οὗτός ἐστ' ἀνδρείος, καὶ χρησίμος γὰρ πολίτης ὁ τοιοῦτός ἐστιν, . . .

The objection to this text is:

How can a statesman, who 'deliberately prefers a policy in which Fortune has more control than forethought and calculation,' be praised by Demosthenes, of all statesmen, and called *χρήσιμος πολίτης*?

The passage may be easily amended by reading: *ἀλλὰ τὸ β. αἰεὶ κἂν (καὶ ἐν) τῇ τοιαύτῃ πολιτείᾳ . . . ἐν ᾗ.*

'But always prefers the best course even in a state in which Fortune,' etc.

ἡ τοιαύτη πολιτεία, referring to Athens, is, in fact, rather an apt description. Cf. *Phil.* I. § 12, p. 43—*εἴ τι πάθῃ καὶ τὰ τῆς τύχης ἡμῶν, ἥπερ αἰεὶ βέλτιον ἢ ἡμεῖς ἡμῶν αὐτῶν ἐπιμελούμεθα*; cf. also the opening of *Olynthiac* II.

The emendation involves only the substitution of *ν* for *ι*, and *vice versa*, a fairly frequent source of corruption in MSS. Cf. *De Halon.*, § 20, where three MSS. read *ξενία*, one *ξενία*, the rest *ξενίαν*; and *Olynth.* III. 34, where there are three variants — *μικρῶν, μικρόν, μικρῶ*.

H. W. WHITE.

Bedford Grammar School.

AESCHYLUS, AGAMEMNON 178-180 (WECKLEIN).

*οὐδ' ὅστις πάροιθεν ἦν μέγας
παμμάχῳ θράσει βρύων
οὐδὲν †λέξει πρὶν ὦν.*

THE popular amendments of the last line are *οὐδὲ λέγεται* (Ahrens), 'will not even be spoken of as once having been,' and *οὐδ' ἐλέγξεται* (Margoliouth), 'will not even be proved to have once existed.' But as regards the first, though it is somewhat tame, it is not easy to see why it should have been corrupted into nonsense; and as regards the second, not only is 'not even' out of place (for what more could be wanted than a proof?), but I believe it ought to mean 'will not even be convicted of having once existed,' as if it were a crime, which cannot be intended. Both also sacrifice *οὐδὲν*, which follows very well on *οὐδέ* above. Might we not rather read *οὐδὲν ἔλξεται*, translating 'not even he who was so great of old, swelling with confidence to fight all comers, will weigh at all as earlier having been'? This carries on

the metaphor of *πάντ' ἐπισταθμόμενος* ('putting all to the scale') and *τὸ μάταν φροντίδος ἄχθος* just above. The poet conceives himself as testing all claimants to divine sovereignty by weighing them against the known facts of human life and destiny; and since the traditional polytheism must be rejected as void of weight, being inadequate to meet the facts, he can conceive of nothing else to make up the balance except the supreme moral government of Zeus. The middle voice of *ἔλκω* occurs in Pindar, *Pyth.* II. 90 *στάθμας δέ τινας ἐλκόμενοι περισσᾶς*, 'tugging as it were at an uneven scale (the envious only inflict a *ἔλκος* on themselves).'

If this will pass, it throws some light on another passage, Soph. *Oed. Col.* 134-137:

*τὰ δὲ νῦν τιν' ἤκειν
λόγος οὐδὲν ἄζονθ', ὃν ἐγὼ λεύσσω
περὶ πᾶν οὐπω δύναμαι τέμενος
γινῶναι ποῦ μοί ποτε ναίει.*

There is no other instance of the active form *ἄζω* for *ἄζομαι*, and Triclinius altered it to *ἄζονθ'*. The reader will observe that this slight change converts the line into an anapaestic dimeter, and that the next is a verse of the same measure, while the next is a paroemiac verse, such as usually closes a system of anapaests. In the antistrophe the anapaests are already perfect, the word corresponding with *ἄζονθ'* being *ἔχεις*. Thus the metre supports Triclinius in expelling the unparalleled *ἄζοντα*. But what does *οὐδὲν ἄζοντα* mean? I would compare *ἄγειν μνᾶν*, 'to weigh a mina,' and translate 'but now there is a report that some worthless fellow (lit. of no weight—i.e., the blind beggar Oedipus) has come, whom I by looking round the whole precinct cannot yet discover, wherever he may be hiding from me.' Sir R. Jebb, who does not recognise the verses as anapaests, but divides them otherwise, retains *ἄζονθ'*, and then, in order to produce correspondence, reads *οἷσεις* for *ἔχεις* in the antistrophe, *οἷσεις* being superscribed to *ἔχεις* in the Laurentian MS. My suggestion is that this makes two errors in the text instead of one.

AUSTIN SMYTH.

3, Temple Gardens, Temple.

REVIEWS

THE BACCHANTS OF EURIPIDES AND OTHER ESSAYS.

The Bacchants of Euripides and Other Essays. By A. W. VERRALL, Litt.D., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. Cambridge: At the University Press. 1910.

The Riddle of the Bacchae: the Last Stage of Euripides' Religious Views. By GILBERT NORWOOD, M.A., Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, Assistant Lecturer in Classics in the University of Manchester. Manchester: At the University Press. 1908.

THE appearance of a new book by Dr. Verrall must always be an event of great interest, but hardly anything he could have given us would have been more welcome than his interpretation of the *Bacchae*: the difficulties in the construction and general intention of the play have always been recognised, and had recently been greatly emphasised in Professor Norwood's Essay. It was generally expected that Dr. Verrall would apply to the *Bacchae* the principles of criticism with which we have become familiar in his previous work on Euripides, and it was no surprise to find that he follows in the main the lines laid down by Professor Norwood, though he has greatly strengthened the argument of the earlier work, partly by the exclusion of pre-suppositions to the action, partly by an interpretation of the play as a whole at once more general and more concise. To deal adequately with Dr. Verrall's book would need a careful examination by a Euripidean specialist, but it may be worth while that a layman should attempt to write the impression which the new theory makes upon him in regard both to its intrinsic probability and its effect on the understanding of the play. As Professor Norwood's work has not hitherto been criticised in the *Classical Review*, I shall include some consideration of its main contentions.

Both essays are primarily an attack on what may be taken to be the traditional view of the play, that it was written to show the divine power of

Dionysus and the futility of human opposition, and that, whether it be regarded as a 'recantation' by Euripides at the end of his life or a claim for the 'orgiastic' ritual of Bacchus as against the staid cults of the orthodox Hellenic religion, it stands apart from the general run of Euripides' plays and represents him at least in a different mood. Such a view of the play Dr. Verrall admits to be possible (p. 17), and he thinks that the 'holiday mob' which saw the play first produced, probably interpreted—and were meant to interpret—it in this sense. But for the band of true Euripideans, with whom Dr. Verrall's previous work has already familiarised us, the play had a meaning very different from its 'face-value.' For these it was not a support of the Dionysiac religion, but a very damaging onslaught upon it: though the chorus, especially in the Hymn to Holiness (370 ff.), suggest the moral value of the more sober side of 'orgiastic' separation, yet the main action of the play is designed to show not only the immorality and cruelty of the Dionysus legend, but the evil effects of the Bacchic enthusiasm. Dionysus is not the suffering but ultimately victorious hero, comparable, as Professor Murray's translation not infrequently hints, to the figure of Christ, but a not over-scrupulous fanatic; Pentheus is no longer the overbearing tyrant, but the hero falling into misfortune, having a *ἁμαρτία* indeed in his rashness and imperiousness, but suffering a fate entirely beyond his deserts. Dr. Verrall takes as typical of the traditional interpretation Professor Murray's translation, and shows, to my mind effectively, how, in order to support it, it has been necessary for him in many places to 'heighten' the language, and lift it into a plane of mysticism and exaltation which a straightforward interpretation of the text will not bear.

To establish the new view it is necessary to prove two main points, (1) that the Dionysus of the play is not

god but man; (2) that the miracles reported are not intended to be believed. We may consider the two points separately. If Dionysus is not the god, who is he? At this point Professor Norwood and Dr. Verrall part company. The former believes the Dionysus of the play to be the son of Semele and some unknown man. The child born at the time of Semele's death was in some way translated to Asia, and there, out of his own emotional musings and his instruction in Eastern philosophy, conceived a new religion of nature: gradually he came to believe in himself, firstly as the hierophant of the new god of his creation, Dionysus, and then, inspired by the legendary account of his birth which has reached him from Thebes, as himself divine. He gathers converts around him in Asia, and crossing over to Europe determines to induce his native city to accept his new belief. Before the play begins, we are to assume, he has had a momentous interview with Teiresias, and by a singular series of arguments, partly theological, partly practical, has won him over to his side (pp. 87-100). This curiously euhemeristic view of the situation, though it would in some respects give a stronger dramatic point to the play than Dr. Verrall's explanation, cannot, I think, for a moment be sustained. There is, as far as I know, nothing to prove that such a line of thought was possible for Euripides or his contemporaries (it certainly strikes one as wholly modern), and Dr. Verrall has sufficiently shown (p. 56, note) that the pre-supposition of such surprising events *ἔξω τοῦ δράματος* is dramatically impossible: the play could not have been intelligible without a 'programme.' Dr. Verrall's own view is not open to these objections: he sees in 'Dionysus' a perfectly human figure, a Lydian stranger, an 'adept,' a fanatic who has learnt the art of hypnotism, and being regarded as divine by his Lydian followers, is determined, without scruple as to means, to force his claims on Hellas. As to the influence of such an interpretation on the general effect of the play I will attempt to say something later: we must ask now whether it is a possible interpretation—in other

words, whether we can account for the events of the play, acted and narrated, on the assumption that Dionysus is a man. This leads at once to the second question of the miracles.

It is not possible to discuss in full the problems which centre round the minor miracles narrated in the speeches of the two messengers, and probably both writers would agree that the new theory must stand or fall on the decision reached with regard, firstly to the 'palace miracle,' as explained in both works, and secondly, to the 'hypnotism' of Pentheus by Dionysus when he assumes the Bacchic dress, as now interpreted by Dr. Verrall. The contention about the 'palace miracle' is briefly this: in the chorus following Dionysus' arrest and despatch within the palace there is reference to an 'earthquake' (585) and the falling of pillars (591), and when Dionysus subsequently comes out he first assumes (605) that the chorus have perceived the 'earthquake,' and later (632) states that the god had 'rent the δώματα to the ground.' Pentheus, when he subsequently appears, makes no reference whatever to these events, nor is there any mention or implication of them in the rest of the play. Now, it is contended, and surely rightly, that it would have been impossible to represent such occurrences on the Attic stage; nor, say Professor Norwood and Dr. Verrall, could the audience be required to imagine them. But, they contend, Euripides did not intend that they should: he never wished the audience to believe in the earthquake or the destruction of the palace, for they never occurred; they were only an hallucination produced hypnotically in the minds of the chorus by the 'mesmeric' power of the 'adept.' Now granting that it is not too much to ask even of an audience of initiated critics that they should thus understand the situation—and to my mind it is a considerably heavier demand than the imaginary destruction of the palace—I still think that a great deal more has been made of the whole incident than is warranted by the text. I see no indication that a total destruction of the palace is intended, but many that it is not. Dionysus is taken into the stables (509) and

there has his struggle with Pentheus: the chorus hears a noise and supposes that 'perhaps the god will shake Pentheus' house to a fall' (587): one member of the chorus asks the rest whether they saw pillars falling (591), Dionysus says, in a phrase of which Dr. Verrall makes much, ἦσθησθ', ὡς ἔοικε, Βακχίου διατινάξαντος κ.τ.λ. (605), and finds it necessary to narrate to the chorus (632) that the god has 'rent' δώματα (with no article) χαμάζε. Now all this seems to me a clear proof not of any hypnotism of the chorus, but that Euripides, intending a real miracle, yet realising the limitations of stage management, purposely placed it in a remote part of the palace, whose destruction would not affect the main building visible to the audience. Dr. Verrall lays much stress on the fact that all subsequent speakers assume the palace to be intact: he has omitted to notice that 'Dionysus' does so himself immediately after he narrates its destruction (ἦσυχος δ' ἐκβὰς ἐγὼ δωμάτων): surely, even if we accept his most ingenious interpretation of συντεθράνεται δ' ἅπαν (633) (which to my mind would produce a parenthesis so jerky as to border on a joke), this sudden restoration would be a considerable strain even on a hypnotised chorus. I believe the 'palace miracle' is a miracle, but on a smaller scale than is generally supposed, and that the difficulty of stage representation was in this way purposely avoided.

The second crisis does not present such serious difficulties. Pentheus, who has entered the palace to discuss his visit to the Bacchanals with Dionysus, returns clad as a Bacchant, silly and foolish, and with all the symptoms of intoxication (912). On the ordinary view this result is taken to be due to the exercise of the influence of the god. Dr. Verrall, who throughout this discussion assumes the humanity of 'Dionysus,' objects firstly, that if this is the result of hypnotism, the process should have been represented on the stage, as it is in Professor Murray's translation of the preceding dialogue, but not, as I think Dr. Verrall has conclusively shown, in the text of Euripides; secondly, that if the effect is due to hypnotic influence alone, there is no

reason for the indications of intoxication. He therefore supposes that the 'adept' induces Pentheus to drink a truce with him and drugs his cup. Such a supposition seems to me unnatural and unnecessary. The process of 'hypnotism' leading up to Pentheus' degraded condition of mind is not represented on the stage, because it would be *μαρόν*: Euripides makes it take place 'within' in pursuance of the normal principles of restraint in Greek drama. Nor, if Dionysus is divine, is there the least difficulty in accounting for the tremendous effect of the exercise of his influence, and if the result resembles that of intoxication, is that strange when the power at work is that of the god of wine? Dr. Verrall's argument is considerably weakened here, because he has not, for critical purposes, viewed the passage in the light of the 'traditional' interpretation, when it presents no difficulties.¹

In the two crucial passages then I feel that Professor Norwood and Dr. Verrall have failed to prove the purely human origin of the 'miraculous' occurrences: and with the reinstatement of the miracles must come the reassertion of the divine character of Dionysus. Are we then to return to the 'traditional' view of the play? I think not, for it seems to me that Dr. Verrall's criticism has put out of court for ever the idea that the *Bacchae* represents a whole-hearted support of the Dionysiac worship, and the belief in Dionysus as the suffering hero in the play. How then can we understand it? To my mind the *Bacchae* is more truly a 'problem' play than any other of

¹ In two later passages in the play Dr. Verrall sees allusions to the drugging of Pentheus: (1) In 913 he would return to the MS. text σπένδοντά τ' ἀσπούδαστα; but apart from the strangeness of the expression, it seems to me impossible that Euripides could have used a phrase so near to the obvious oxymoron σπένδοντα ἀσπούδαστα without producing almost the effect of a bad pun. (2) In 1157 he sees in the much-vexed νάρθηκά τε, πιστὸν Ἄιδαν, ἔλαβεν εὐθυρσον a double *entente*, νάρθηκα being used to suggest the libation cup as well as the wand, πιστὸν to act as the verbal adjective from πίνειν as well as in its more ordinary sense. The idea is brilliant, but surely far too subtle to be caught even by the initiated—and that not in dialogue, but in the course of a choric song.

Euripides, in that, although he approaches his subject in a sceptical spirit, he does not, as in other cases, force his sceptical conclusions on his audience. He seems to me to say practically this: 'Here is the ancient legend as it must have happened, if it be true, and here are the results of the Bacchic enthusiasm; in both you will see much that is brutal, cruel, and even bestial: yet there is a truly great religious element in this unquestioning exaltation of spirit, even as there are fine traits in the character of the Dionysus of the legend. I present this to you, and you must draw your conclusion.' What that conclusion was in his own mind could not be better expressed than in Professor Norwood's chapter (ii) on the general attitude of Euripides, in which he argues that he believed in religion, but disbelieved the popular mythology. And surely on this view we have a far stronger argument, a far more Euripidean treatment, than in Dr. Verrall's supposition of the human 'adept': for Euripides is in fact attacking the god himself, as represented in legend, and not a mere human priest. It is a greater thing to show the immorality of a dogmatic

belief than the immorality of its credited exponents.

I have not left myself space to speak of the other essays in Dr. Verrall's book, which contain one and all matter of great interest. One of them, 'The Meeting of Idomeneus,' is an ingenious application of Dr. Verrall's principles of dissection to the Homeric problem; another, 'Christ before Herod,' an extension of the method beyond its ordinary scope. Perhaps the most interesting essay to most classical readers will be the examination of the use of rhyme in Greek Tragedy in 'Rhyme and Reason'; it opens up quite new possibilities of understanding many passages. I need not add that the whole book is written in that arresting manner, pungent and brilliant, yet firm in touch, which makes Dr. Verrall's works almost unique in the criticism of the Classics. Every page is suggestive, and the reader puts the book down with a consciousness of a great many new problems to think about, and a feeling that he must return to the reading of Greek with many fresh interests.

CYRIL BAILEY.

Balliol College, Oxford.

WELTENMANTEL UND HIMMELSZELT.

Weltenmantel und Himmelszelt. By ROBERT EISLER. 2 vols. 4to. Pp. xxxii+811. illustrations. Munich: Oskar Beck. 1910. M. 40.

Weltenmantel und Himmelszelt is the title of a very learned and noteworthy investigation of the ideas of the ancient civilised world about the shape of the universe. The author, Herr Robert Eisler, has ranged over a very wide field, from the kingdoms of Sumer and Accad to the Holy Roman Empire and from the Avesta to the Zohar. No single reviewer can venture to sit in judgment upon him over this extended area, and indeed the first word should in justice be one of unqualified praise. Even if specialists decline on some points to ratify his conclusions in their own province, Herr Eisler will still deserve our gratitude in having introduced us

to the many problems discussed in the book which are brought together there in one connexion.

We begin with the Coronation Robe of the Emperor Henry II. (1014), now preserved at Bamberg, a gorgeous blue cloak with the Zodiac and other heavenly bodies embroidered upon it. This Robe is shown to be the medieval equivalent of the *toga picta* of Constantius Gallus and other Roman Emperors (p. 38), which in its turn is derived from the Robe worn by the victorious Roman general at a Triumph, itself the mystic dress of the ancient Kings (p. 43), whose clothing was after the fashion of the God of Heaven Himself (p. 45).

In chap. ii. it is shown that the proper clothing of God or Goddess is the heavens, starry or cloudy. 'The Heavens are the work of Thy hands—

as a vesture shalt Thou change them,' quotes Herr Eisler on p. 88, and goes on to remark: 'Besonders die Schlussworte weisen deutlich auf das bekannte Ritual der regelmässig erneuerten Götterkleider hin.' I should have thought that the change of seasons, not to speak of changes of weather, might have suggested the words, quite apart from the fact that the Psalmist definitely refers to the creation of the heavens in the beginning. It is a pity that Herr Eisler is so determined to press everything into the service of his thesis.

In chap. iii. we come to the weaving of the Cosmic Web. It is the Web of Penelope. Penelope, more known as St. Agatha, patroness of Sicily, is said to be Persephone. Her lord, who finally succeeds in obtaining possession of her, is Odysseus, or rather Olyseus the Destroyer, who is also Plutus (p. 136). It is all connected with the *ἱερὸς γάμος* of Heaven and Earth, to prepare for which the Web is made by the woman in the story of Penelope-Persephone, but by the man in the myth of the marriage of Zeus and Chthonie in Pherecydes (p. 129). Another form of the same rite, according to Herr Eisler, is to be seen in the crowning or covering of the sacred Mithra-tree (*δένδρον μίτρωσις*). 'Wie Sandan, Zoganes, Kottys-Attis, Sandra-Kottos and *Ku-anna*¹ Astrochiton ist also auch Mithras nichts anders als der selbständig adorierte, hieratisch-symbolische, weltbedeutende Schmuck (*κάδμος-κόσμος*) des heiligen Baumes' (p. 181).

In chap. iv. we come to a discussion of the Tent of Heaven, which takes up the greater part of the second volume (pp. 321-632). Herr Eisler starts with the fragments of Pherecydes' Cosmogony. By an ingenious emendation (p. 351) he introduces Hera into the text, regarding Chthonie as the mystical name of Hera in connexion with the holy marriage of the Heaven and Earth. According to Eisler (p. 599 *f.*) the marriage of Zeus and Chthonie takes place by the heaven-God Zeus throwing

the star-embroidered mantle (*φᾶρος*) over the winged tree which the earth-Goddess Chthonie has caused to spring out of the ground. This is the divine marriage-tent, which signified the universe in which heaven and earth move and have their being. The divine marriage is the pattern of all other marriage ceremonies, and so it comes to pass that the *Himmelszelt* survives in the canopy under which still Jewish brides and bridegrooms are united.

Eternal beside Zeus and Chthonie there was also Chronos, a personage who reappears in the mysteries of Mithra. From Chronos come Wind and Fire and Water; nay more, *χρόνος ἀπείρος*—unending Time—was the *κίνησις* of everything (p. 541). This idea of Chronos is prominent in Magian religion, where it is brought in as the cause of all things.² Perhaps the chief value of Chronos to us in the system of Pherecydes is that his presence makes it clear that the system is partly due to Magian speculation.

The antique conception of the world as a tent or house is actually figured in the diagrams which accompany the *Christian Topography* of Cosmas Indicopleustes, and are given by Eisler on pp. 621-624. In these the universe is depicted as something not unlike a Saratoga trunk, with the kingdom of heaven in the arched lid, which is supported by the 'pillars of heaven.' On the earth is the great mountain, whose shadow hides the sun's light when it goes behind it every night. Herr Eisler points out (p. 625 *f.*) that well as the *Topography* of Cosmas fits certain passages of the Old Testament it was not only from the Bible that he derived his ideas, but also (as he himself tells us) from Mar Aba of Nisibis, then Nestorian Patriarch. Mar Aba had been a Magian priest before his conversion, and Herr Eisler suggests that his views on the shape of the universe are Magian. It should be noted, however, that this is a mere conjecture of Eisler's; what we know of Mar Aba from other sources (see

¹ Said to be a name for Nebo at Borsippa, p. 172. Even 'John Barleycorn, das bekannte Gedicht von John (*sic*) Burns' is pressed into the service, p. 148.

² Ζουπονιά, ὃν ἀρχηγὸν πάντων εἰσάγει, says Theodore of Mopsuestia (quoted, p. 415).

Wright's *Syriac Literature*, pp. 116-118) would suggest that his point of view in later life had become wholly Christian and ecclesiastical.

However this may be, Herr Eisler has done well to bring this antique *Weltanschauung* before us and to contrast it with the spherical system of Ptolemy, which he rightly regards as modern and scientific, the result of observation rather than of mystic imaginings. The polemic of Cosmas Indicopleustes, he says, is not essentially a disagreement between Christian and 'Classical' cosmology. Rather it is the last struggle of two views about the world, the one mystical and religious, belonging to the East, the other having its origin in the West, and in its nature intellectual and scientific. The Greeks had started from the Eastern view. Not only Pherecydes, when he regards the visible heavens as a tent and the world as a seven-cornered Cave, a Cave such as the sanctuaries of the worshippers of Mithra, but also Anaxamenes and Heraclites, who make the sun at night disappear behind the Mountain of the North, Parmenides who speaks of the walls of heaven, the Orphics who speak of the four-pillared *μέγαρον* of the world, Anaximander with his anarchical astronomy—all these belong to another order of things than that wonderful series of systems which, starting from the primitive similes of ancient mystic cosmogony, such as the Egg, the Nut, the Apple, led up in so comparatively short a time to the system of Ptolemy and the immortal conjecture of Aristarchus of Samos. Herr Eisler, whose words I have paraphrased, goes on to point out (p. 631) that this second view is purely Hellenic and belongs to Science. The other view is essentially not scientific but religious, and like all Religion comes to us from the Orient.

In justice to the magnitude and com-

plexity of Herr Eisler's work, I have tried rather to describe than to criticise. As I have however already indicated, its chief fault is the endeavour to press all sorts of incongruous stuff into the service of the main theme. A few details may conveniently be noted here, mostly connected with the Semitic side of the investigation. Thus on p. 381, Mabbog, the Syriac name of Hierapolis-Bambyce, has nothing to do with *mabbūa'* (spring), as may be seen from the Arabic form Manbij. And in the same Note 'āphka, if it be a real Syriac word at all, has nothing to do with 'ēphah (to embrace), the first letter being quite different, though no doubt inaudible to Greeks. On p. 230 ff. St. Peter's vision at Joppa is explained to mean that the σκευός in which the apostle sees all the animals is the Viylon (*Velum*) or lowest Rabbinical heaven! Peter, according to Herr Eisler, sees the archetypes of the animals in the sky, and thereby recognises that they are all God's creatures and not 'chthonic.' Herr Eisler appeals to *Geist und Tiefe*, but his new interpretation hardly applies to the command to 'slay and eat.' Every Jew knew from Genesis that all animals had been created by God, but that did not make all animals lawful for food.

Equally far-fetched is Herr Eisler's explanation of Psalm xix. 4-6 on p. 601, according to which it is *vollkommen klar* that the verses describe how the God (El) celebrates His marriage with the Sun. El is the Moon-God and the Sun is His bride! Herr Eisler does not satisfactorily explain how it can be said of the Moon that 'nothing is hid from the heat thereof' (*hammāthō*, a word specially used of the Sun).

Of the final chapter, which treats of Thales, and the genesis of those abstract ideas that form the groundwork of philosophical theology, I do not feel competent to say anything.

F. C. BURKITT.

GREEK PAPYRI IN THE BRITISH MUSEUM.

Greek Papyri in the British Museum. Catalogue with Texts. Vol. IV. The Aphrodito Papyri, edited by H. I. BELL, M.A. With an Appendix of Coptic Papyri, edited by W. E. CRUM, M.A. British Museum. 1910.

THIS volume contains a collection of documents 'all from one village and all falling within a little over twenty years—that is, between 698 and 711 A.D.' The Coptic papyri, which are added, concern the same persons and subjects, and the two illustrate each other. The texts are printed without breathings or accents, but the words are separated: abbreviations are not extended, but they are explained in an index.

Aphrodito, or *κώμη Ἀφροδίτης*, is now identified with the earlier Aphroditopolis hitherto supposed to be elsewhere. The place was once the capital of a nome, but it evidently declined into a village. The subdivisions of the place, fourteen in number, can be found from a comparison of the documents. It is odd that a large sum is paid for taxes by *οἱ ὄντες ἐν Βαβυλῶνι* (i.e. Fustât, Old Cairo): probably the place furnished sailors or workmen of some special class, like the modern Astypalaeans porters of Smyrna and Constantinople, and they seem to have emigrated on condition of paying their tax. Several monasteries were mentioned; the word *ὄρος* is sometimes used for a 'desert monastery.' The documents also are instructive for the organisation of Egypt, even of the Khalifate generally. *Ἀνατολή* seems to be the name of a province, part of Asia Minor: *Φόσσατον* (Fustât) is capital of the province of Egypt: these and other indications help to show that the Arabs left the Byzantine organisation much as it had been. The eparchies remained, and each seems to have had its *δοῦξ* (*εὐκλεέστατος*). Other officials are *ζυγοστάται* and *χαρτουλάριοι*. There is some new evidence on the relation of *παγαρχία* and the ancient nome: the editor argues that the nome continued as a geographical division, the pagarchy being the official unit. These documents disclose a vast amount of red-tape.

A section of the introduction is given to the system of Taxes, which appear very clearly, with their mode of assessment and collection. There were taxes in coin and taxes in kind, which the Government called for as it wanted them. There were a land-tax (*δημόσιον*), poll-tax (*ἀνδρισμός*, also called *διάγραφον*, probably *διαγραφή*), and *δαπάνη*, or special allowances: taxes in kind were *ἐμβολαί*. Women paid no poll-tax. Besides these, *ἐκστραόρδυνα* could be levied, and personal service required at need.

This volume is specially full of information about the navy. Each province had its fleet, and yearly raids (*κούρσα*) were made on the domains of the empire. There were building yards and arsenals (one at Babylon). Ships were manned by *ναῦται* and *μάχοι*, the sailors being got by conscription. Light is also thrown on the relations of governors to governed, on the price of many commodities, on wages and the general cost of living. The taxes seem to have been heavy, but perhaps not so heavy as under Byzantium.

We are not able to judge of the penmanship of the writers, as no facsimiles are given; but the documents are peculiar in having a number of dots and marks, which are sometimes used for stops, sometimes between double consonants, often with no clear reason. For language the documents are important. New words and new senses are common, and many anticipations of modern Greek. *ω* and *ο* are confused, and so are *η* *υ* *ι*; there is a strong liking for double adverbs in compound verbs, and for new prepositional groups.

The letters from the governor to the pagarch deal with fugitives, requisitions of men, taxes, fines, posts, official duties (1349), and other topics. There are allusions to Trajan's canal (1346), the raid on Sicily by Atā b. Rāfi (1350, *Ἀτταβίου Παφί*), the mosques of Jerusalem and Damascus. Other letters go from the governor to the tax-payers (*ἐντάγμια*), ordering payment of taxes. Most of the other documents are accounts and registers, which are difficult to interpret and full of abbreviations. These con-

tain
nam
book
serv
been
been
the h
here
out o
not
know
befor
name
σταπ
σταφ
(pray
σιναν
κένου
(wine
impor
variou
χωρία
pletes
The
maries
the C
letters
The
tees (n
the G

COMM
BRU

Comme
episto
rem
Sjög
167.
1910

K. LEI
De Cic
sendis
showed
ing the
which
also a T
by a f
eleventh
at Wü
MSS., v
the Torn
and oth
found m

tain a number of technical terms and names of officials. Several complete books of many pages have been preserved: one of them (1414), which had been torn to pieces and scattered, has been restored almost completely with the help of the others. It is impossible here to discuss the questions that arise out of these accounts, which would need not only large space but very special knowledge; probably it will be long before their difficulties are solved. Many names of articles are mentioned—e.g., σταπῆς (raisins, almost the modern σταφίδι), κιλίκια, ακανθαί, γοναχία (prayer-carpets?), ψιαθοί, τυλαρία, κένδουκλον (felt), πησσομένα (nails), οἶνος (wine), αλογα (horses), καρίσια. An important register is 1433, which gives various requisitions arranged under χωρία. A section of Protocols completes the Greek papyri.

The 150 Coptic papyri have summaries or translations added, in which the Greek titles are given in Greek letters.

These documents consist of guarantees (no example of this class amongst the Greek papyri), registers, receipts,

and others, often different in form from the Greek, but on the same general subjects. We may note as curious παραμυθία 1497 and φιλοτιμία 1565, apparently in the sense of 'douceur.'

After reading the documents, the impression left is that the syntax and accidentae are better than might have been expected. Whilst there are many unclassical uses, as of εἰ sometimes, εἰ φανῶσιν, εἰ μὴ ἂν ἐκπέμψης, we find οὐ μὴ correctly used and other common constructions. The style is wordy and obscure, and there are many phrases of current speech which are strange: κατέλαβε τὰ πρὸς ἡμᾶς 'come down our way' is common, παρ' ὃ ἡς ἐθεματίσαμεν διατιμήσεως 'contrary to' is found once, διὰ στρατάς 'immediately.' Some Latin words are used, as ορρία, ἐκστρατοδυναρία; some Arab words, as μασγίδα (masjid), αμαλιτης (a porter?). For the new Greek words and new senses the student may refer to the Indices (Subjects, Persons, Places, Taxes, Symbols, Words, 148 pages). Our legislators may take a hint from Egypt and impose an air-tax (ἀερίκον).

W. H. D. ROUSE.

COMMENTATIONES TULLIANAE, DE CICERONIS EPISTULIS AD BRUTUM AD QUINTUM FRATREM AD ATTICUM QUAESTIONES.

Commentationes Tullianae, de Ciceronis epistulis ad Brutum ad Quintum Fratrem ad Atticum Quaestiones. By H. SJÖGREN. Two facsimiles. Pp. 1-167. Upsala: Almqvist et Wiksell, 1910.

K. LEHMANN, in his masterly treatise, *De Ciceronis ad Atticum epistulis recensendis et emendandis* (Berlin, 1892), showed that the Italian MSS. containing these letters fall into two families, which he termed Σ and Δ. There is also a Transalpine tradition, represented by a few leaves from a MS. of the eleventh, or twelfth, century MS. found at Würzburg (W), and by two lost MSS., viz. the *Codex Cratandri* (C) and the *Tornaesianus* (Z), used by Lambinus and other French scholars. Lehmann found many agreements between Σ and

CWZ, and considered the order of merit to be (1) CWZ, (2) Σ, (3) Δ. He published variants from his MSS. in the case of letters printed in Hofmann's edition, but did not live to construct an apparatus for the whole collection. On his death-bed he gave orders that his collations were to be destroyed, so that his work has had to be done over again.

The task has been worthily carried out by Dr. H. Sjögren of Upsala, who has produced a treatise conspicuous for modesty, sobriety of judgment, and soundness of method. Although he differs from Lehmann upon some minor points, he agrees with him upon those which are essential, thus establishing the permanent value of Lehmann's work.

The division of the Italian MSS. into Σ and Δ is fully consonant with the facts recorded concerning the discovery of

MSS. at the time of the Renaissance. There was in the fourteenth century a MS. belonging to the Cathedral of Verona, which was used in 1329 by the anonymous compiler of the *Flores Morales*,¹ still contained in this library (*Veronensis* clxviii.), shortly afterwards by Pastrengo of Verona, a friend of Petrarch, who quotes from these letters in his work, *De Originibus Rerum*,² and in 1345 by Petrarch, who made a copy of it with his own hand.³ We know that a MS. containing these letters, which had belonged to the Cathedral of Verona, was sent to Milan in 1390, a fact which requires no explanation when we remember that Verona was captured by the Milanese on June 26 in that year.⁴ Coluccio, Chancellor of Florence, obtained from Pasquino, Chancellor of Milan, in 1392 a copy of this MS., which is now in the Laurentian Library, XLIX, 18 (*M*). This MS., the value of which has been much disputed, is the chief member of Lehmann's Δ . We also hear of a second discovery made in 1409 by Bartolommeo della Capra of Pistoia. This is described by Leonardo Aretino as *volumen antiquissimum sane ac reverendum*.⁵ He says that it contained *Att.* i.-vii., in addition to the letters to Brutus and Quintus. As the Σ MSS. are mutilated and defective, generally containing these particular books, there is a *prima facie* probability that they, or some of them, are derived from this second fount. We also hear of what apparently was a third MS., described as a *liber veterrimus*, which in 1412 was in the possession of Giovanni Corvini (Johannes Arretinus) at Milan.⁶ I ven-

ture to make a suggestion further on concerning descendants of this MS.

Lehmann's view was revolutionary, since previously *M* had been considered the chief, if not the only, source of evidence. This opinion is still held by O. E. Schmidt,⁷ who considers Σ to be interpolated MSS. derived from it, and, though sometimes he speaks more doubtfully, is inclined to hold that *C* and *Z* were drawn from this contaminated source. There are grave chronological objections to Schmidt's theory. Thus *E* (*Ambros.* E. 14 *inf.*), the chief member of Σ , is said by Lehmann to be a fourteenth-century MS., and to be older than *M*. As I have myself examined both *E* and *M*, I may be permitted to associate myself with this view. Also, there is good ground for identifying *Z* with a MS. which formerly belonged to Cluni, No. 492, in the twelfth-century catalogue.⁸ It may be mentioned that *Clun.* 498, containing Cicero in Catilinam, the *Caesarianae* and part of the *Verrines*, which is now in the Holkham Library, is a ninth-century MS., while *Clun.* 496, containing Cicero, *pro Sex. Roscio, pro Murena*, etc., which was taken to Italy in 1415 by Poggio, appears to have been older still.⁹ It is, therefore, likely, that *Z* was a MS. written not later than the ninth century. Other difficulties, e.g. the impossibility of deriving from *M* within the limits of time necessary to Schmidt's theory MSS. which differ so widely from *M*, are well dealt with by Sjögren.

Lehmann has shown that apart from *E*, which occupies a place by itself, the Σ family falls into two groups, which he terms Π and Φ . The chief representatives of these groups, according to him, are *Laur. Conv. Soppr.* 49 (*N*) and *Taur.* 495 (*O*) respectively. He also placed among Φ certain MSS. used by Malaspina, and a Ravenna MS. (*Rav.*), of which I shall say something later. Sjögren has recollated *N* and other Σ MSS. used by Lehmann, but not *O*,

¹ The *Flores* contain two quotations from the letters to Brutus, viz. *f.* 10 v. (*Brut.* i. 15. 9) *vicit amentia levissimi hominis nostram prudentiam*, and *f.* 25 v. (*ib.* i. 1. 1) *nihil enim minus hominis videtur quam non respondere in amore huius a quibus provocare (sic)*. The second is said to come in *quadam epla ad Brutum*; the first is headed *Cic. libro 3 epl. ad Brutum*. Cf. *Class. Rev.* xx. (1906), p. 224, n. 4. I thought it well to verify the references not long ago when passing through Verona.

² Sabbadini, *Scoperte dei codici*, p. 18.

³ The MS. was probably shown to Petrarch by Pastrengo. Cf. Voigt i. p. 207 n.

⁴ Sabbadini, *Scoperte*, p. 7, n. 23.

⁵ Leonardi Aretini, *Epp.* iii. 13, ed. Mehus.

⁶ Sabbadini, *Scoperte*, p. 74.

⁷ *Die handschriftliche Überlieferung der Briefe Ciceronis*, Leipzig, 1887; *Der Briefwechsel des M. Tullius Cicero*, Leipzig, 1893.

⁸ L. Gurlitt, *Berl. Phil. Woch.* xiv. (1894) p. 925.

⁹ *Anecdota Oxoniensia* x. (The *vetus Cluniensis* of Poggio), p. xvii sqq.

which has been greatly damaged by the recent conflagration at the Turin library. In place of it he relies chiefly upon *Paris*. 8536 (P), and *Palatinus* 1510 (Pal.), a MS. not used by Lehmann. His chief representative of Π is *Paris*. *Nouv. Fonds* 16248 (G), a MS. to which attention was first called in the pages of this Review (*Classical Review*, x. pp. 321 sqq., 1896). He also has made a careful study of Δ and especially of the corrections in *M*. Some of these are made by the second hand without comment, while others are introduced by c^o or *al*. Schmidt assigned these to various persons who possessed the MS., viz. Coluccio, Niccolo Niccoli,¹ and Leonardo Aretino, and Sjögren appears to agree with the identification. He rejects, however, Schmidt's singular theory that c^o = Coluccius, and considers this symbol, which is also found in *N*, to be a *communis nota*. Sjögren finds that the c^o variants are taken from some MS. belonging to Δ , a conclusion which is puzzling, since elsewhere c^o , where I have observed it, introduces conjectures. Thus in Poggio's copy of Asconius it is used three times before an emendation, just as *credo* is also employed. I have also noticed it in Sozomenus' copy of Asconius, and it is frequently used before conjectures in *Laur.* (Gadd.), xc. Sup. 69.² Sjögren considers that the ordinary corrections in *M* (M^2) are also taken from Δ . I should have thought it possible that some of them might represent variants occurring in the *Veronensis*, and subsequently added by the corrector. This, however, would not agree with the theory of Schmidt and Sjögren, which attributes them to Coluccio. The variants introduced by *al*. are said by Sjögren to be taken from a MS. of the Σ family, possibly from *E* or *N*. The most important conclusion at which Sjögren arrives is, that the variants ascribed to Niccolo (M^3) are derived from the MS. of Capra. The evidence for this statement is that these mar-

ginalia only exist in those books (*ad Brut.*, *ad Q.F.*, *Att.* i.-vii.), which we know to have been contained in this MS. This seems to be an important clue which should throw further light upon the affinities and value of the Σ group.³ The readings ascribed to Leonardo (M^4) are regarded as conjectures. I would only remark that several of them are palmary, e.g. *Att.* viii. 15. 3 *me derideri*, M^4 : *mederi cett.*

Previous writers have considered *M* to be the parent of a considerable family. Sjögren goes to the other extreme and regards it as *apais*. In such a matter it is necessary to go very warily, and I would only say that some of his arguments do not convince me. Thus when speaking of *Vrb.* 322 (*S*), he will not allow that it is copied from *M* (p. 29): later on (p. 155) he notices that in *Att.* iii. 25:

perspicio nobis in hac calamitate tabescendum esse. Neque enim—sed bonam in partem accipies—si ulla spes salutis subesset, tu discessisses

Coluccio has written *tabesco* in the margin of *M*, thereby calling attention to the word. Here *S* absurdly inserts *tabesco* after *neque enim*. I do not see how this can be explained, if *S* is not derived from *M*. My own experience of the Poggian MSS. of Asconius and Valerius Flaccus, all of which are derived from his transcript now at Madrid (X. 81), would lead me to expect great variety in the later copies, especially in their treatment of corrections and marginalia.⁴ Thus the Vatican MS. of Valerius Flaccus (no. 1613), the origin of which is clear from the fact that a passage of 82 lines which it omits occupies two pages in the Madrid MS., frequently gives what is shown by other evidence to have been the original reading of the *Matritensis*, but which has been tampered with or erased in that MS. by a corrector. So also in the MSS. of Asconius, the scribes have dealt with the readings of the various hands of the *Matritensis* in a very puzzling manner, sometimes preferring a con-

¹ Sjögren speaks of Niccolo as '*dives Florentinus*,' which seems odd. He was a poor man, except for the liberality of Cosimo de Medici, and at his death he owed 500 ducats to the bank of the Medici. Voigt (i. p. 305) happily calls him *der arme Mäcen*.

² *Anecdota Oxoniensia*, x., p. xlvi.

³ The *Codex Caprae* appears to have resembled *GH*, i.e. the Π division of Σ . It is tempting to suppose that the other division, Φ , may be connected with the MS. of Corvini.

⁴ *Classical Review*, xiii. (1899), p. 121. Asconius, ed. Oxon., pp. xxii-xxviii.

jecture and sometimes retaining the original corruption. I do not, therefore, feel convinced that *m* (*Berol. Ham.* 166) is not derived from *M*, though it frequently gives the reading of *M*¹, neglecting a simple correction made by *M*².

Sjögren has what I venture to think a strange theory regarding the origin of *M*. He holds that the *Veronensis* from which Coluccio obtained a copy was not the MS. used by Petrarch in 1345, but another MS. which subsequently emerged at the same place. *Prima facie* this would appear very improbable, since MSS. of these letters were excessively rare before the fourteenth century. His argument that another *Veronensis* may have been found after the first, just as a third *Parisinus* (*G*) came to light recently after Lehmann's collations, is misleading, since all three Paris MSS. belong to a period when *codices* had been multiplied. Sjögren's theory is founded on a fact previously noticed by Lehmann, viz. that Petrarch, when quoting from these letters, not unfrequently has a reading which is not that of *M* (or *M*¹), but is found in a MS. of the Σ group. Lehmann goes so far as to include Petrarch's apograph among Σ . Some of his instances are important, others are doubtful, and a number of cases only show that Petrarch agrees with *M*² as against *M*¹. Lehmann is arguing that *M* is not copied from Petrarch's transcript, and he appears to prove this. I cannot, however, see anything in the facts inconsistent with the derivation both of his transcript and also of *M* from a single fount, viz. the *Veronensis* of Petrarch. This, like all MSS., must have contained variants, erasures and corruptions, which would receive different treatment from Petrarch and the scribes employed by Pasquino in 1392. It must also be remembered that, according to Lehmann and Sjögren, Σ and Δ are both derived from a common archetype (Ω), so there is nothing surprising if Σ readings survived in Petrarch's apograph, while they have been replaced by a variant or corruption in Δ . This appears to me more likely than Sjögren's theory of an $\delta\mu\acute{o}\nu\nu\mu\omicron\varsigma$. I have previously noticed a reason for the transference of the *Veronensis* to Milan in 1390, viz. the conquest of Verona by

Gian Galeazzo Visconti in that year; and agree with Voigt in thinking that the ancient MS. of these Letters, of which Decembrio speaks in a letter written about 1415 as existing at Milan,¹ was no other than the *Veronensis* of Petrarch.

The second part of Sjögren's treatise deals with a large number of passages, chiefly taken from the letters *ad Brut.*, *ad Q.F.*, *ad Att.* i., vii. He has a great advantage over all his predecessors, since they did not possess a full *apparatus criticus*. The first and most important duty of an editor of what must in many ways rank as an *editio princeps* is to establish the reading of the MSS., and of this fact he is deeply conscious. His position may be briefly described as that of an extreme conservative. In a large number of instances he successfully defends the reading of the MSS., frequently relying upon a weapon already used by the Dublin editors, viz. the employment by Cicero of idioms borrowed from Plautus and Terence. He also possesses a wide knowledge of Ciceronian idiom and usage, which may be observed in such notes as those upon the ethic dative (p. 117), on mixture of pronouns in *oratio obliqua* (p. 122) and of tenses in parallel clauses (p. 126), collocations like *ut aut . . . aut ut* (p. 126), the rhetorical plural (p. 142), and the use of the future of *volo* in such passages as *Att.* xiv. 1. 2: *quicquid volet, valde volet* (p. 150). Among other cases where he defends the reading of the best MSS. with great skill are *Brut.* i. 18. 3 *si is* (p. 119), *Q.F.* i. 3. 2 *iracundiae causam* (p. 129), ii. 3. 1 *de imperio Lentuli abrogando* (p. 132), iii. 1. 23 *coniecta* (p. 141), *Att.* i. 18. 3 *instat hic nunc annus* (p. 149), viii. 11 p. 7 *a teque ad ea* (p. 167). In some others I do not feel convinced, though I recognise the ingenuity of the argument, e.g. p. 134.

Q.F. ii. 13. 2 *quoniam ut scribis poema ab eo nostrum probari*. So MSS., *tu scribis* edd. Sjögren defends *ut* by Terence *Adelph.* 648 *ut opinor eas non nosse te et certo scio*. The passages quoted from Cicero seem to be different, and the confusion of *tu* and *ut* is constant.

¹ Cf. Schmidt, *Die handschriftliche Überlieferung*, etc., p. 60.

Att. ii. 11. 2 (p. 115). *Haec igitur, et cura ut valeas.* So the best MSS.: *et* is generally omitted by editors, but defended by Sjögren. It is, however, noted by Schmidt, whose remark he endorses (p. 38), that *et* in *M* frequently stands for a mark of punctuation which was in the archetype. This explanation would suit the present case and gives a good sense, i.e. 'This is all I have to say. Take care of your health.'

Sjögren's methods may be studied in the following example, *Q.F.* i. 2. 5 (p. 127):

scribis cupisse te. . . Zeuxim eligere omni ratione voluisse, [ultra] quem adductum in iudicium fortasse an dimitti non oportuerit, conquiri vero et elici blanditiis, ut tu scribis, ad iudicium necesse non fuit.

For *eligere* *M*⁴ (i.e. Leonardo) gives *elicere*, so edd.: *ultra* is given by *M*, and omitted by *Σ*: *fortasse dimitti non oportuerat* *M*⁴ (Leonardo) and edd.

Sjögren defends *fortasse an* by a quotation from Accius, and several from Varro, also from Aulus Gellius, who affected archaic idioms. Strange as such a construction may appear in Cicero, it is hard to resist the evidence brought forward. On the other hand, Sjögren's retention of *eligere* seems quite paradoxical, since *elicere* is demanded by *elici* immediately afterwards. No confusion is more common than that of *C* and *G*, due to similarity not only in capital script, but also in pronunciation. Thus *Att.* viii. 14. 2, *elicere cupio sententiam tuam M⁴ EOR*, and doubtless most other MSS., give *eligere* (*elicere* *M*² and Petrarch, *Epp.* xviii. 8). The same corruption is found in the best MSS. in *Balb.* 37 *praemiis elicere*, and *Vat.* 14 *inferorum animas elicere*.

Sjögren omits *ultra* with *Σ*, but does not give any reason for its appearance in *M*. I would suggest that there was a variant *traductum*, i.e. that in *Ω*, the common archetype of *ΣM*, there was

ultra adductum.

Other examples of extreme conservatism are:

Att. ii. 1. 5 (p. 143), *quaerit ex me num consuessem Siculis locum gladiatoribus dare. Negavi. 'At ego,' inquit, 'novos patronos institutam.'*

Here editors read *novus patronus*. Sjögren says that Clodius refers 'ad

novam quasi seriem patronorum designandam a se tamquam duce ac principe ortam,' which seems very forced. *Novos* is clearly an old spelling for *novus*, and the corruption *patronos* is due to misunderstanding. Cf. *Mil.* 79 *quonam modo ille vos vivus* (vivos *HET*) *adficeret, quos mortuus* (mortuos *H*) *inani cogitatione percussit?*

Att. iv. 8 A. 3 (p. 148):

Quid sit quod se a me removet, si modo removet, ignoro. Here for the first *removit* editors read *removerit* (or *remorit*). A subjunctive is required by all the laws of Latinity. Sjögren says that the indicative is *mirabilis atque inauditus*, and that other examples quoted from Cicero are not similar. He keeps, however, the indicative, 'qui nulla re magis quam ratione aequabilitatis excusatur.' The corruption is so simple and common that the authority of the MSS. appears to me to be nil.

Q.F. iii. 1.8 (p. 146):

Id facit Oppius non numquam necessario ut, cum tabellarios constituerit mittere . . . serius quam constituerat mittat, neque nos datis iam epistulis diem commutari curamus.

Sjögren says '*curamus* Lehmannus sine iusta causa, etsi sic debuisset scribere Ciceronem nemo non videt.' The assimilation of moods after *ut* is exceedingly simple, and I do not like to admit that Cicero wrote bad grammar. It would be ungenerous to dilate upon such points in view of the great and solid merits of Sjögren's work. I would only say that if he offends, *in eam partem potius peccat quae est cautior* (*Rosc. Am.* 56).

Although Sjögren describes himself as *coniecturarum parvus*, those which he has made are good. Perhaps the best is *Q.F.* ii. 1. 3 (p. 132) *tum Clodius rogatus diem dicendi eximere coepit*.

Here editors read *dicendo* with *M³SO²*. Sjögren suggests <*calumnia*> *dicendi* referring to *Att.* iv. 3. 3 *Metellus calumnia dicendi tempus exemit*, and other passages.

Other interesting suggestions are:

Att. vii. 3, 7 *et amicorum* <*et alienorum*> *multitudine occupati*.

Att. iv. 17. 3 *censuerunt comitia primo quoque tempore haberi* [*censere*].

Att. iv. 4. A. 1 *Offendes designationem Tyrannionis mirificam librorum meorum* [*bibliotheca*].

Sjögren regards *bibliotheca* (so *M*, om. Σ) as an index word from the margin of the archetype, a view which seems convincing. In *Q.F.* ii. 7. 1 he thinks that the mysterious words *non curantia* may be a gloss for ἀπραγμοσύνη, and in *Q.F.* i. 2. 14 suggests that the archetype may have had
*in custodiam Ephesi tradidit sed in pub-
 licam vel in ^{pietrum} privatam non satis . . . intel-
 legere possumus.*

These examples show Sjögren's skill as a textual critic, and make us hope that in the future he will not keep himself under such stern restraint.

I would conclude this notice by making a few remarks about the Ravenna MS. (*Rav.*), which seems to have been hardly used of late. It enjoyed for a time a blaze of glory in consequence of a strange mistake made by Mommsen, who, when a young man, declared it to have been written in the thirteenth century and to be '*praeclarum omniumque qui supersunt Epp. ad Atticum MSS. sine ullo dubio antiquissimum.*'¹ In a letter to Garatoni, which is still to be seen at Ravenna, he refers to the excellence of the Greek in *Rav.*, and supposes that a knowledge of Greek survived at Ravenna after it had been forgotten elsewhere. It was pointed out by Detlefsen and Boot that the MS. was written in the fifteenth century, and it is so described in Cappi's catalogue. When I examined it myself, it appeared to me a normal fifteenth-century MS.

¹ Cf. Lehmann, p. 44.

without any indications of superior antiquity. I observed the following marginal note made by the writer upon *Att.* i. 11. 3, where Cicero is speaking of the books left to him by the brother of Paetus, viz. *Erat M. Tullius librorum avidus, sed in ea re cedebat tibi, Florentine.* This can only have been written after the Florentine scholars had begun to collect MSS.

Lehmann did not collate *Rav.* which, on the strength of certain readings published by Boot, he pronounced to be a member of Σ , and specially connected with *O*. Sjögren does not appear to have seen *Rav.*,² which he considers on the evidence of Boot's excerpts to be a *gemellus*, not only of *O*, but of *Palat.* 1510 (*Pal.*). He says '*certum igitur est, Pal. et Rav. gemellos esse: quae cum ita sint, satis visum est Pal. tantum conferre.*' As some years ago I spent two or three days over *Rav.*, which I collated with the variants given in Purser's text, I may be unduly partial towards it. I can only say that it appeared to me to have some striking readings, and that, merely on the ground of superior age, I should have thought that it deserved to be preferred to *Pal.*, which, according to Sjögren, was written at the end of the fifteenth century.

ALBERT C. CLARK.

Queen's College, Oxford.

² He mentions (p. 4 n.) that, if Boot is to be trusted, in *Att.* iii. 8. 2 *Rav.* has *ab Illo*. I find from my collation that it gives *ab illo* with the other MSS.

SHORT NOTICES

FOUR PLAYS OF MENANDER.

Four Plays of Menander. Edited by E. CAPPS, Professor of Classics in Princeton University. Pp. x. 329. Ginn and Co. 1910. Price 10/6.

To the literature of the new Menander fragments Prof. Capps has added a very serviceable edition with introductions, commentary, and critical notes. It

wavers in some degree, as he himself acknowledges, between the wants of the junior and those of the senior student, but on the whole it is meant more for the former, who will find in it a good deal that is useful. For such a reader perhaps further points of Greek might have been noticed, e.g. in the earlier part of the *Epitrepontes* line 8 the form σχολάσαις, line 11 and elsewhere the

New Comedy λαλῶ=λέγω, 128 πρὸ πολλοῦ *some time before*, 136 the plural in εὐκριτ' ἐστί. On small but not unimportant points in Menander's use of the comic trimeter there are a good many useful notes, founded on Prof. J. W. White's valuable paper in *Classical Philology*, vol. iv. The introductions are full, interesting, and good, dealing with the conjectural restoration of the plots, the characterisation, matters of technique, etc. The argument for introducing into the *Epitrepontes* fragment 2 A of the St. Petersburg find is acute and persuasive. A better way has been expressed for the poet's 'inimitable dialogue and monologue' than most readers will feel, but enthusiasm is no bad quality in an editor. A better way has been found of indicating letters and words inserted conjecturally than the unsightly and exasperating brackets so familiar in papyrus texts. An index to the notes and introductions would have been welcome. The only misprint I notice is an awkward εὐρησις for εὔρεσις in *Epitr.* 102.

The critical notes give a good many of the restorations proposed by various scholars at the time of the first publication and since, including a fair number of Prof. Capps' own, and he has of course printed many of them in his text. At the beginning of the *Epitr.* I cannot follow his argument for reading δίκαια δὲ πάσχω as a question, and in 116 I do not see why οἱ πρὶν should be turned into οἱ τότε, unless all words or uses whatever unusual in prose (e.g. θηρᾶν for θηρεύειν in 107, ἐρρύσατο in 125) are to be rejected in Menander. *Samia* 404 (Körte etc. 261) παῖδας πολὺ πράττεται, 'he makes a good deal of boys' (*sic*), is surely an impossible expression. *Epitr.* 153 οὐκ ἂν φόβην is much best given to Davus, meaning that he never thought to receive such treatment. The name Περικειρομένη should not be translated as though it were a perfect participle. The present tense rather expresses an act, like *The Rape of the Lock*.

Considering the very fragmentary nature of the remains, amounting in the case of the *Hero* to less than 100 lines, the title of this volume is a little misleading. The uninstructed reader

would naturally expect to find four plays complete or nearly so.

H. RICHARDS.

THE DAWN OF MEDITERRANEAN CIVILISATION.

The Dawn of Mediterranean Civilisation.

By ANGELO MOSSO. With 203 illustrations. Translated by M. C. Harrison. Fisher Unwin, 1910.

Mosso was an enthusiast, but he took up archaeology without the necessary training. Hence his theories will not always commend themselves to scholars. Thus he seems to identify commerce with civilisation (p. 12). His statements are often vague, as: 'A uniform culture existed in the whole basin of the Mediterranean, and lasted several thousand years' (2). This book, like the author's last, is rather a notebook than a treatise. Its value lies in the illustrations, which are excellent: many of them are inaccessible otherwise to most people—for instance, a sacrificial scene from the painted sarcophagus of Hagia Triadha (frontispiece), the inscribed disc, a transcription of part of it.

One chapter contains a number of notes on the origin of writing. Mosso follows Pernier in regarding the signs scratched on the walls at Cnossos and Phaistos not as marks of consecration, but in some way literary. The next chapter contains notes on early Egypt; in this appears a Minoan soldier from a steatite vase (Fig. 23) 'with a boomerang.' The author did not notice that he is wearing the same soft top-boots which the Cretans have always worn ever since. Then come notes on Minoan vases, neolithic weapons, the copper age in Crete, more pottery, the sacred axe. 'The first offerings made to the mysterious power which rules the world were weapons,' says Mosso: he figures a number of stone axes, but why he calls them 'votive' does not appear. This leads us up to the bipennis=πέλεκυς (*bipennae*, he calls them, p. 143, or is it his translator?). A chapter on fat women follows: Mosso thinks the Mother Goddess was represented both in a thin form and a fat form, and con-

nects this with the negro taste in female beauty. Perhaps the prehistoric artist did his best. It would not be useful to go through the whole book in detail; its subjects are too many, and its method too discursive. But one or two more may be specified. One chapter deals with 'tumuli or dolmens,' which Mosso uses as synonyms. He makes the remark, as if it needed only to be said, that 'the dolmens mark the path of prehistoric commerce' (p. 220). He names two or three, and then gives several pages to the broken pottery which he found in one of them: after which he describes, with photographs, several dolmens of South Italy. Another section gives *pintaderas* from various parts of Europe: these were used to impress painted patterns upon the human skin. Among them he includes what other people have called seals. Primitive ships, primitive commerce, the distribution of forests, early copper mines, agriculture, and the Mediterranean race, all come in for consideration: and the author has no sooner touched on one, than he is away to something else. All through the book are scattered those generalisations that tantalise us so: one or two we have mentioned, and another is, that 'the destruction of the forests was the cause of malaria.'

We close the book perplexed and pleased at once. It is full of matter, full of interest, but without order or

settled aim: a notebook, which the reader will be glad to possess.

W. H. D. R.

Walter Headlam: Life and Poems. By CECIL HEADLAM DUCKWORTH. 1910.

IT is difficult to write in a critical temper of this book: and it must be enough to recommend it to those who knew Headlam, and those who not knowing him have the love of things good in their hearts. The life was uneventful: its story is told simply. It will interest all to learn that he was descended from the great Richard Bentley. His literary genius was joined to a bright and humorous talent, which makes the tale of his daily round pleasant even for strangers to read. He wrote Greek verse like a Greek; some new specimens are given here in a light vein. The original English poems at the end will come as a surprise to many. The biographer may be right or wrong in his high estimate of what might have been; but no one will fail to see that there is real poetry in these scanty remains. Headlam's translations into English verse seem often to be hampered by something; they do not always satisfy a critical ear: but the original verse is quite free from that suspicion, and much of it is beautiful. It seems as though the gods have a grudge against the Greek language: *Requiescat in Pace*.

X.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editor of THE CLASSICAL REVIEW.

DEAR MR. EDITOR,—I should be glad if you would allow me to comment briefly upon a point in the review of Professor Wilkinson's 'Hannibal's March.'

The statement on p. 116 of the June number of the *Classical Review* of the supposed discrepancy between Livy and Polybius as to the point of Hannibal's arrival in Italy gives fresh currency to an old blunder (I believe of Mommsen's) which has injured English text-books of Roman history for a whole generation, though it has been exposed in recent years; e.g., Mr. F. E. A. Trayer, in his excellent edition of *Livy XXI.*, p. 197 (Bell and Sons, 1901), states clearly what Polybius really does say on this

point. It is quite true that in III. 56. 3 Polybius states of Hannibal in the sentence so often quoted *κατ'ἤρπε τολμηρῶς εἰς τὰ περὶ τὸν Πάδον πεδία καὶ τὸ τῶν Ἰνσούμβρων ἔθνος*. He then breaks off into two or three pages of digression about the way in which 'modern' readers should judge ancient historians, who, as he wisely remarks, would have 'taken full advantage of our modern advantages' (*τῶν νῦν καιρῶν ἐπιλαβόμενοι*, c. 58. 5) had they been accessible to them. This digression has been too much for many of Polybius' readers, and diverted their attention from the fact that when he resumes his narrative (c. 60) he makes a much more definite statement as to the point at which Hannibal reached Italy, which precisely confirms Livy instead of raising doubts.

C. 60, § 1. τὸ μὲν οὖν πλῆθος τῆς δυνάμεως ὅσον ἔχων Ἀννίβας ἐνέβαλεν εἰς Ἰταλίαν, ἥδη δεδηλώκαμεν. μετὰ δὲ τὴν εἰσβολὴν καταστρατοπεδεύσας ὑπ' αὐτὴν τὴν παρώρειαν τῶν Ἀλπέων τὰς μὲν ἀρχὰς ἀνελάμβανε τὰς δυνάμεις. . . . [Then follows an explanation of the physical sufferings caused to the army by the passage of the Alps. In section 8 he then continues:] μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα, προσανεληφύας ἥδη τῆς δυνάμεως, τῶν Ταυρίνων οἱ τυγχάνουσι πρὸς τῇ παρωρείᾳ κατοικοῦντες στασιαζόντων μὲν πρὸς τοὺς Ἰνσόμβρας ἀπιστούντων δὲ τοῖς Καρχηδονίοις, τὸ μὲν πρῶτον αὐτοὺς εἰς φιλίαν προῦκαλεῖτο καὶ συμβαχίαν· οὐχ ὑπακούοντων δὲ, περὶ στρατοπεδεύσας τὴν βαρυτάτην πόλιν ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις ἐξεπολιόρ-

κησε. By the repeated use of this word παρώρεια, and by his repeated reference to the period of rest and refreshment given by Hannibal to his army, Polybius makes it clear to demonstration that the point at which Hannibal touched the plains was in the territory of the Taurini. This point was made by Mr. Marindin twelve years ago in the *Classical Review* (xiii., p. 248), so that perhaps it is too much to hope that the blunder will even yet die out. Readers of this year's *Classical Review* at least should know that on this point Professor Wilkinson (p. 6, footnote) is a safer guide than Mommsen's *Roman History*, vol. ii., p. 106.—Yours very faithfully,

R. S. CONWAY.

VERSION

TO DIANA.

COME, my Diana, let us make
A garden very trim and fair;
And you shall walk as mistress there,
And I will toil with spade and rake.
And there, for our entire delight,
A thousand blossoms shall unfold,
The pansy and the marigold,
The crimson pink and lily white.
There not a thorn shall mar the rose,
And every sugar'd fruit that grows
Shall ripen when the flowers are done:
Betwixt us we'll divide the rent:—
Your share shall all be pure content,
The tears, the labour mine alone.

D'AUBIGNÉ.

AD PHYLLIDA

I MECUM, mea Phyllis, atque amoenum
omni munditia paremus hortum;
illic tu domina ambulabis, illic
exercebo ego sarculi labores:
illic milia multa flosculorum,
rubri si quid honoris est uel albi,
nostras delicias, repandet aestas,—
albam parthenicem, rosamque rubram,
spinis liuidulis rosam carentem;
et post floriferum rubet annuum
pomorum quod ubique suauiorumst.
mercedem unde rogas? uterque partem:
nam tu laetitiam meram rependes,
sudores ego lacrimasque solus.

H. RACKHAM.

(Translated by H. C. MACDOWALL.)

NOTES AND NEWS

CONGREGATION at Oxford passed in May by a substantial majority the preamble of a statute intended to exempt candidates for mathematical and scientific honours from offering Greek in Responsions; and as amendments have been rejected, the statute will next term come before the University for its final ratification. It may still of course be thrown out either by Congregation or by Convocation; but failing a late repentance on the part of

some of its supporters, or an unwonted activity among non-resident Masters of Arts, the Bill will probably pass.

This abandonment of the principle (hitherto maintained, and still probably true) that a modicum of Greek is essential to the best education will clearly have a far-reaching effect on schools and Universities. In many schools Greek teaching will undoubtedly disappear altogether—a result which many advocates of 'Reform' contem-

plate with equanimity; while, as it is the expressed wish of the promoters of the statute to extend its operation to candidates for honours other than scientific and mathematical, it must soon be possible at Oxford, and presumably at Cambridge too, to obtain any honours degree without knowledge of Greek. Strangely enough, the majority of academic residents seem to consider that this inevitable result is not disastrous either to the candidates or to Greek scholarship.

The Bedford College players gave Sophocles' *Trachiniae* at the Royal Court Theatre, Sloane Square, on July 6, 7 and 8. The performance was a success, and it deserves notice for several reasons. The music, specially written by Mr. H. O. Anderton, was very pleasing; it did not drown the text, as has been the case too often at Cambridge, but the words of the chorus were very generally audible. The dances were graceful, the singing beautifully clear. The actors

did not gabble—another fault of the Cambridge plays—but spoke their words distinctly. They used the reformed pronunciation, which again kept the words from sounding like echoes of English. It is a pity that all the accents were ignored: may we hope that the next time this may be changed? We can promise the hearers a new pleasure if it is.

We hope next month to offer a few remarks on the dramatic effect of the play, which was not what might be expected from the comments of learned scholiasts.

Attention may be called to a paper in *Classical Philology* for July. Mr. D. R. Stuart examines the prenuptial rite in the new Callimachus; and concludes that it was not what scholars have assumed. He adduces parallels to show that before the marriage the bride took to her bed a boy of tender years, and that this was a rite to ensure fertility: sympathetic magic.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Publishers and Authors forwarding books for review are asked to send at the same time a note of the price.

** * Excerpts and Extracts from Periodicals and Collections are not included in these Lists unless stated to be separately published.*

- Adam (J.)** The Vitality of Platonism and other Essays. 9" x 5½". Pp. viii + 242. Cambridge: University Press, 1911. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.
- Aeschylus.** Agamemnon. The Greek Text with English Translation Parallel. By the Sixth Form boys of Bradfield College. 7" x 5". Pp. viii + 60. Oxford: University Press, 1911. 1s. 6d.
- Ante Limen.** Compiled, under the guidance of Professors Walters and Conway, by R. H. Rees. 7½" x 5". Pp. 128. London: John Murray, 1911. Cloth, 1s. 6d.
- Αρχαιολογική Ἐφημερίς**, 1910. περίοδος τρίτη. Vols. iii. and iv., with 9 plates and 97 illustrations in the text. 12½" x 9½". Pp. 177-432. Athens: Archaeological Society, 1911.
- Aristophanes.** Clouds. With Introduction, English Prose Translation, Critical Notes, etc., by W. J. M. Starkie. 9" x 5½". Pp. lxxxviii + 370. London: Macmillan and Co., 1911. Cloth, 12s.
- Aristotle.** De Arte Poetica. Second Edition. By I. Bywater. Bibliotheca Oxoniensis. 7½" x 5". Oxford: University Press, 1911. Cloth, 2s.
- Berthold (O.)** Die Unverwundbarkeit in Sage und Aberglauben der Griechen. Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten. Band xi, Heft 1. 9" x 6". Pp. 72. Giessen: A. Töpelmann, 1911. M. 2.60.
- Bonhöffer (A.)** Epiktet und das neue Testament. (Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten. Band x.) 9" x 6". Pp. xii + 412. Giessen: A. Töpelmann, 1911. M. 15.
- Bury (J. B.)** Romances of Chivalry on Greek Soil. Romanes Lecture for 1911. 9" x 6". Pp. 24. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911. 2s. net.
- Cantarelli (L.)** La Serie dei Prefetti di Egitto: II. Da Diocletiano alla morte di Teodosio I. (A.D. 284-395). 11½" x 8½". Pp. 50. Roma: Tipografia della R. Acc. dei Lincei, 1911.
- Cauer (P.)** Das Altertum im Leben der Gegenwart. (Aus Natur- und Geisteswelt, 356 Bändchen.) 7¼" x 5". Pp. viii + 122. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1911. Cloth, M. 1.25.
- Cézard (E.)** Métrique Sacrée des Grecs et des Romains. 6¾" x 4½". Pp. 538. Paris: C. Klincksieck, 1911. Cloth, fr. 8.

- Cicero*. Paradoxa Stoicorum Academicorum Reliquiae cum Lucullo: Timaeus: de Natura Deorum: De Divinatione: De Fato. By O. Plasberg. Fasc. II. 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 6 $\frac{1}{4}$ ". Pp. 199-399. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1911. M. 8.
- Cippolini* (A.) Roma-Carmen. Nel MMDCLXIV. Natale di Roma. 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 6 $\frac{1}{4}$ ". Pp. 34. Milan: A. De Mohr, 1911. L. 1.
- Classical Philology*, July, 1911, vol. vi., No. 3. 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 6 $\frac{1}{4}$ ". Pp. 255-384. Chicago: University Press. Subscription \$2.50, foreign \$2.75.
- Cosenza* (M. E.) Petrarch's Letters to Classical Authors. Translated from the Latin, with a Commentary. 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 5". Pp. xiv + 208. Cambridge: University Press, 1911. Cloth, 4s. net.
- Florilegium Latinum*. Heft I, Drama; II, Erzählende Prosa. Teubner's Classical Library. 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. 72 and 77. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1911. M. 0.60 each.
- Ford* (H. G.) and *Caudwell* (L. V.) An Elementary Latin Exercise-Book. 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 5". Pp. xiii + 229. London: Methuen and Co., 1911. Cloth, 2s. 6d.
- Fowler* (W. W.) The Religious Experience of the Roman People. 9" x 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. xviii + 504. London: Macmillan and Co., 1911. Cloth, 12s. net.
- Holder* (A.) Alt-Celtischer Sprachschatz. Twentieth Lieferung. 10 $\frac{3}{4}$ " x 7". Pp. 770 to 1023.
- Holmes* (T. R.) Caesar's Conquest of Gaul. Second Edition. 9" x 6". Pp. xxxix + 872. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911. Cloth, 21s. net.
- Hönn* (K.) Quellenuntersuchungen zu den Viten des Heliogabalus und des Severus Alexander—im corpus der Scriptores Historiae Augustae. 9" x 6". Pp. vi + 252. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1911. M. 8.
- Jones* (E. E. C.) A New Law of Thought and its Logical Bearings. Girton College Studies, No. IV. 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 5". Pp. vii + 75. Cambridge: University Press, 1911. Cloth, 2s. net.
- Kleine Texte für theologische und philologische Vorlesungen und Übungen*. 8" x 5". Herausgegeben von Hans Lietzmann. (Griechische Papyri, ausgewählt und erklärt von Prof. D. Hans Lietzmann. 2. Aufl. 32 S. M. 0.80. Antike Fluchtafeln, ausgewählt und erklärt von Prof. Dr. Richard Wünsch. 28 S. M. 0.60. Lateinische christliche Inschriften mit einem Anhang jüdischer Inschriften, ausgewählt und erklärt von Prof. Dr. Ernst Diehl. 48 S. M. 1.20. Res gestae divi Augusti, herausgegeben und erklärt von Prof. Dr. Ernst Diehl. 2. Aufl. 40 S. M. 1.20. Supplementum Lyricum, neue Bruchstücke von Archilochus Alcaeus Sappho Corinna Pindar, ausgewählt und erklärt von Prof. Dr. Ernst Diehl. 2. Aufl. 44 S. M. 1.20. Altlateinische Inschriften von Prof. Dr. Ernst Diehl. 64 S. M. 1.80. Fasti Consulares Imperii Romani von 30 v. Chr. bis 565 n. Chr. mit Kaiserliste und Anhang bearbeitet von Willy Liebenam. 128 S. M. 3, gbd. M. 3.40. Menandri reliquiae nuper repertae, herausgeg. von Prof. Dr. Siegfried Sudhaus. 65 S. M. 1.80, gbd. M. 2.20. Pompeianische Wandinschriften und Verwandtes, ausgewählt von Prof. Dr. Ernst Diehl. 60 S. M. 1.80. Altitalische Inschriften, herausgegeben von H. Jacobsohn. 32 S. M. 0.80. Vulgärlateinische Inschriften, herausgeg. von Prof. Dr. Ernst Diehl. 180 S. Brosch. M. 4.50, geb. M. 5. Aus der antiken Schule. Sammlung griechischer Texte auf Papyrus Holztafeln Ostraka, ausgewählt und erklärt von Dr. Erich Ziebarth. 23 S. M. 0.60. Aristophanes Frösche, mit ausgewählten antiken Scholien herausgeg. von Dr. Wilhelm Süss. 90 S. Brosch. M. 2, geb. M. 2.40. Poetarum veterum Romanorum Reliquiae selegit Ernestus Diehl. 165 S. Brosch. M. 2.50, geb. M. 3. Cicero pro Milone mit dem Commentar des Asconius und den Scholia Bobbiensia, herausg. von Dr. Paul Wessner. M. 1.20. Die Vitae Vergilianae und ihre antiken Quellen, herausgeg. von Prof. Dr. Ernst Diehl. 60 S. M. 1.50. Bonn: A. Marcus und E. Weber.)
- Kornitzer* (A.) Lateinisches Übungsbuch für Obergymnasien. 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 6". Pp. 256. Vienna: F. Tempsky, 1910. M. 3.
- Lieben* (E.) Zur Biographie Märtials. 9" x 6 $\frac{1}{4}$ ". Pp. 28. Prague: Rohlieck and Sievers, 1911.
- Livy*. Camillus and other Stories. By G. M. Edwards. Pitt Press Series. 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. xvi + 124. Cambridge: University Press, 1911. Cloth, 1s. 6d.
- Mahaffy* (J. P.) The Silver Age of the Greek World. 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. 482. Cambridge: University Press, 1911. Cloth, 6s. net.
- Man's Greatest Discovery*. By the Swami Vallinayakam. 7" x 5". Pp. 42. Madras: The Authors' and Publishers' Agency, 1911. 8d.
- Mantuanus*: The Eclogues of Baptista. Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by Wilfred P. Mustard, Ph.D., Collegiate Professor of Latin in the Johns Hopkins University. 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 5". Pp. 156. Oxford: Parker and Son. Cloth, 6s. 6d. net, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, \$1.50.
- Martin* (V.) Les Epistatèges (Contribution à l'Étude des Institutions de l'Égypte Gréco-Romaine). 10" x 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. xvi + 203. Geneva: Georg and Co., 1911. Fr. 10.
- Martini* (E.) Textgeschichte der Bibliothek des Patriarchen Photios von Konstantinopel. I. Teil. Die Handschriften, Ausgaben, und Übertragungen. 11 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 8". Pp. 133. Mit 8 Tafeln in Lichtdruck. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1911. M. 7.
- Moulton* (J. H.) Einleitung in die Sprache des Neuen Testaments auf Grund der vom Verfasser neu bearbeiteten 3. englischen Auflage, übersetzte deutsche Ausgabe. Indo-Germanische Bibliothek. 1. Reihe: Grammatiken 9. 8" x 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. xx + 416. Heidelberg: Winter, 1911. M. 7.20, cl. M. 8.

- Murray* (G.) *The Rise of the Greek Epic*. Second Edition, revised and enlarged. 9" x 6". Pp. 368. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.
- Neher* (R.) *Der Anonymus de Rebus Bellicis*. 9" x 6½". Pp. x + 74. Tübingen: J. J. Heckenhauer, 1911.
- Nelz* (C. F.) *De Faciendi Verborum usu Platónico*. 8½" x 5½". Pp. 92. Bonn: C. George, 1911.
- Papyri Graecae Berolinenses* collegit Gulielmus Schubart. 50 Tafeln in Lichtdruck. Auswahl von Urkunden und litterarischen Papyri des Berliner Museums. Tabulae in Usum Scholarum, 2. 11¼" x 8¼". Bonn: A. Marcus und E. Webers, 1911. Geb. in Leinenband M. 6. In ganz Pergament M. 12.
- Pauly—Wissowa—Kroll*. *Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*. Vol. vii. 1. Fornax—Glykon. 10" x 6½". Pp. 1471. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler, 1910. M. 15.
- Preussische Jahrbücher*. By H. Delbrück. Band 144. 9" x 6". Pp. 381-572. Berlin: G. Stilke, 1911. M. 2.50.
- Proceedings of the Classical Association*, January, 1911. Vol. viii. 8½" x 5½". Pp. 266. London: John Murray, 1911. 2s. 6d. net.
- Psichari* (M. J.) *Cassia et la Pomme d'Or*. (Extrait de l'Annuaire de l'École pratique des Hautes-Études.) 9" x 5½". Pp. 54. Paris: J. Gamber, 1911. Fr. 1.50.
- Ptolemäische Homerfragmente*, herausg. u. erklärt von Dr. G. A. Gerhard. Griechisch-Literarische Papyri: Heidelberger Papyrus-Sammlung, IV. 1. 13" x 10". Pp. x + 120, 6 plates. Heidelberg: Winter, 1911. Boards, M. 16.
- Richardson* (R. B.) *A History of Greek Sculpture*. (Greek Series for Colleges and Schools.) 7½" x 5". Pp. 291. New York: American Book Co., 1911. Cloth.
- Robin* (L.) *Les 'Mémoires' de Xénophon, et notre connaissance de la philosophie de Socrate*. 8½" x 5½". Pp. 48. Paris: Félix Alcan, 1911.
- Rouse* (W. H. D.) *The New Renaissance: An Answer to Sir E. Ray Lankester (Nineteenth Century, March, 1911)*. 7¼" x 4¾". Pp. 15. Cambridge: Heffer and Sons, 1911. 3d.
- Schöne* (A.) *Neun Briefe Gottfried Hermanns an E. Platner, C. B. Meissner, L. Spengel, R. Härtel*, herausgegeben von Hermann Schöne. Festgabe der phil. Fakultät der K. Univ. in Greifswald zum 350jährigen Jubiläum des städtischen Gymnasiums in Greifswald. 10" x 7½". Pp. 28. Greifswald: Bruncken, 1911.
- Schwarz* (A. B.) *Hypothek und Hypallagma*. Beitrag zum Pfand- und Vollstreckungsrecht der griechischen Papyri. 9" x 6". Pp. vii + 152. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1911. M. 6.
- Schwarz* (E.) *Charakterköpfe aus der antiken Literatur*, zweite Reihe. 8" x 5½". Pp. 142. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1911. M. 2.20.
- Sophocles*. Philoctetes. By F. W. Schneidewin and A. Nauck. 8" x 5". Pp. 159. Berlin: Weidmann, 1911. M. 1.60.
- Steele* (R.) *Opera hactenus inedita Rogeri Baconi*, Fasc. III. Liber Primus Communium Naturalium Fratris Rogeri, Partes Tertia et Quarta. 8½" x 5½". Pp. vi and 137-308. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911. 10s. 6d. net.
- Syria*: Publications of the Princeton University Archaeological Expeditions to. Division II.: Ancient Architecture in Syria, by H. C. Butler. Division III.: Greek and Latin Inscriptions in Syria, by E. Littmann, D. Magie, and D. R. Stuart. Section A: Southern Syria. Part 2: Southern Hauran. 12¼" x 10". Pp. 150 + xxvi + 132 + xxviii. Maps, plates, and illustrations. Leyden: E. J. Brill, 1910. M. 23.50.
- Thieling* (W.) *Der Hellenismus in Kleinafrika*. Der Griechische Kultureinfluss in den Römischen Provinzen Nordwestafrikas. Mit einer Karte. 9" x 6". Pp. xii + 216. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1911. M. 8.
- Ussani* (V.) *In Romam Carmen, Doctoris Latinis Litteris Tradendis in Certamine Poetico Capitolino magna laude ornatum*. Palermo: The University, 1910.
- Vahlen* (J.) *Gesammelte Philologische Schriften*. Erster Teil: Schriften der Wiener Zeit, 1858-1874. 9" x 6". Pp. vii + 658. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1911. M. 14.
- Voci Amiche*. Rivista Femminile Mensile. June, 1911. 10" x 7". Pp. 40. Anno I, Num. 6. Milan, 1911. Un numero separato. L. 50.
- Weinreich* (O.) *Der Trug des Nektarebos*. Wandlungen eines Novellenstoffs. 9¼" x 6". Pp. x + 164. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1911. M. 4.